

AUG 20 1915

DETROIT.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XIII, No. 19 }
WHOLE No. 332 }

AUGUST 21, 1915

{ PRICE 10 CENTS
{ \$3.00 A YEAR**CHRONICLE**

The War: Bulletin, Aug. 10, a. m.-Aug. 17, p. m.
—The Dardanelles—The Balkan Crisis—U. S.
Reply to Austria. Austria-Hungary: A Momen-
tous Question. Germany: Lissauer's "Chant of
Hate." Great Britain: Northcliffe and Conspira-
tion. Mexico: Americans' Appeal—Plunder and
Violence—Pan-American Note—Yucatan and
Liberty457-460

TOPICS OF INTEREST

The Collapse of Socialism—Defects of the
Catholic Press—The Young Man and Stock
Raising—A Scandalized Contemporary—Why
Are Our Children "Different"?461-467

COMMUNICATIONS

Flowers and Funerals—Ben Jonson as a Cath-
olic—Votes for Women—Protest of an Anglo-
Catholic—Have We Nothing?—Delinquents and
Laundries—"American Spelling"467-469

EDITORIALS

A New Aristocracy—A Children's Text-Book—
The Prisoner and You—The Pope and the Press
—Cowardly Neutrality—Liberty, Its Use and
Abuse470-473

LITERATURE

The Catholic's Bookshelf: Coventry Patmore.

REVIEWS: De Ethica Naturali—Questions of Moral
Theology—What Should I Believe?—The Eng-
lish Essays and Essayists.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS: The August Month—"K,"—
"Hepsey Burke"—"Penelope's Postscripts"—
"The Children: a Message to Priests, Teachers,
Parents, and all Lovers of Christ's Little Ones,"
—"Civilization and Culture"—Commercial Work
and Training for Girls—"In God's Army:
Commanders-in-Chief"—"Love's Gradatory"—
"Life of Father Richard Henle, S.V.D."

BOOKS RECEIVED473-476

EDUCATION

Normal School Psychology477-478

SOCIOLOGY

The Central Verein Convention478-479

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Castellane Appeal Rejected—Missionary
Activity Among Catholic Deaf Mutes—Rome's
War Program—Catholic Women's War Day—
An Appeal for the Foreign Missions—Y. M. C.
A. Hall Opened to Bigots—The Outlook and the
Pope—Christ on a Sunday Shelf—The Limita-
tions of Protestantism—A Plea for a Better
Understanding of the Chinese—Mrs. Porter's
Simple Literary Creed—The End of the War—
Sentimentalism Toward Criminals479-480

CHRONICLE

The War.—Before the Russian resistance the German army under General von Buelow halted a while at Kovno, and in the Courland district on the north, and Field Marshal von Hindenburg was sent there himself to take charge of the operations. Further south and east Field Marshal von Hindenburg captured the fortress of Ostrov, Prince Leopold captured Siedlce and Sokolov, and General von Mackensen captured Lukow and Radzyn. This brings the German advance at its nearest point within thirty miles of the main Russian line of defense against invasion extending south between Kovno, Grodno, Bielstock, Brest-Litovsk and Vlodava. The Russians having escaped apparently from the German trap, it is expected that they will make their stand on this new ground, and that the decisive battle will be fought there in the near future. The only railroad out of Warsaw now remaining in the hands of the Russians, namely, the one to Petrograd, is also threatened by German advances north and south of Kovno under the new leader.

The operations in the Dardanelles have been resumed with new activity, on the part of the Allies, the forces of Turks resisting fiercely, but suffering, it is reported, from a lack of arms and ammunition. Se-

The Dardanelles vere fighting has been taking place at the end of the Gallipoli Peninsula near Ari Burnu and Sedd-el-Bahr, and the Allies have also succeeded, according to their official report, in landing a new force of 50,000 troops at Suvla Bay, some twenty miles to the north, and in fortifying their position along the shore.

Germany and Austria are said to have been mobilizing a large force of 300,000 men at Orsowa on the northeast

border of Serbia, where that State abutts on Hungary and Roumania, for a drive across Serbia and Bulgaria, to the relief of the Dardanelles. Obviously it is to the interest of the Allies to form a strong league of the Balkan States and Greece against the passage of the German army, or at least to win Bulgaria over to their side. Bulgaria has hitherto inclined rather toward the side of Germany, but, realizing her opportunity for expansion, she proposes, it is reported, to help the Allies on condition of receiving from Roumania, Serbia and Greece certain concessions of land taken from her in 1913 in the Treaty of Bucharest, and largely inhabited by Bulgarians. Roumania has refused to comply with Germany's demand for a free passage for war munitions to Turkey and has mobilized a part of her army at Orsowa in preparation for the crisis; the Greek Cabinet is reported to have resigned, giving way to the party of M. Venizelos, the former Premier, who is known to be strongly in favor of the cause of the Allies. Serbia's reply to Bulgaria will be, it is reported, the deciding factor.

In a strong note of August 12, 1915 the United States Government gives its reasons for not complying with Austria-Hungary's demand for an embargo upon war munitions, as follows:

**U. S. Reply
to Austria**

"The principles of international law, the practice of nations, the national safety of the United States and other nations without great military and naval establishments, the prevention of increased armies and navies, the adoption of peaceful methods for the adjustment of international differences, and finally neutrality itself are opposed to the prohibition by a neutral nation of the exportation of arms, ammunition or other munitions of war to belligerent powers during the progress of the war."

Austria-Hungary.—The national economist Professor Julius Wolf, of Berlin, has published interesting figures in the *Neuen Freien Presse* of Vienna to show the ad-

A Momentous Question

advantages Austria will reap from closer economic relations with Germany. The export of Austria for 1900 amounted in value to 1,900,000,000 crowns, and for 1913 to 2,800,000,000 crowns. That of Germany for the same years was respectively 4,600,000,000 marks and 10,000,000,000 marks. Reducing both to the same terms the Austrian export has increased only 1.6 per cent. during these thirteen years as against an increase of 2.3 per cent. on the part of Germany. In the markets where the greatest profits are made Austria has secured almost no foothold. Professor Wolf argues that the conditions for production are in some regards no less favorable in Austria than in Germany, while in no sense can they account for the difference in commercial progress between the two nations. He holds, therefore, that it would greatly profit Austria-Hungary to join itself more closely to Germany in an economic union and to utilize to the utmost the German initiative. There is considerable division of opinion in regard to this entire question. The step which Austria-Hungary is called upon to take is so momentous that careful deliberation is evidently required. Austrians of note and influence are not wanting who believe that this is the time which must decide their country's economic greatness. The matter has thus been stated by them:

The hour has come when the economic conditions of Austria-Hungary can be placed in their proper relation to the world's economic order. We must now bring about a division of work and an exchange of goods with the German Empire which is suited to our own peculiar development. It is time to find a form of economic cooperation with the Germanic spirit of enterprise, talent for organization and power of capital which will weld together even more closely, if that is possible, our bond of political unity.

Germany.—It is refreshing to note the attitude of German Catholics in regard to Ernst Lissauer's chant of hate, "Hassgesang," against England. The *Kölnische Volks-Zeitung*, the organ of the

Lissauer's "Chant of Hate"

powerful Center Party, was the first to demand exclusion of the verses from all books intended for the young and thus attacks the un-Christian sentiment of the poem:

A Christian cannot read Lissauer's hate-song today without having it go against his grain, despite all England has done to us. The object of these lines is to start a popular agitation to keep the Lissauer song out of all books which are destined for school children. The German press is asked to give this agitation the widest publicity.

Editorially the same paper remarks that the war has been conducted with bitterness enough without nourishing the youth of the country on feelings of passionate hatred which would have serious consequences in the future. This of course is a step in full conformity with the wishes of the Holy Father and indeed with the de-

mands of our Faith. The campaign has been favorably taken up by the German press, the *Berliner Tageblatt* remarking:

We read Lissauer's successful hate-song at the time of its appearance with unconcealed disapproval, for it is utterly devoid of real patriotism, and merely, like the rubber stamps of *Gott Strafe England*, "God punish England," panders to certain instincts which unfortunately come to the fore in excited times. A close investigator knows that the brave men in the trenches are nearly always free from this "hate," and it is chiefly preached by persons whose heroism varies with their distance behind the front. That the hate-song and similar products are to be kept out of books for the young is a necessity.

The author himself has since declared that the verses were written "as a result of the passionate impulse in the first week of the war, when the impression created by England's declaration of war was fresh." They were directed, he says, not against the individual Englishmen but against "the English will to destroy which threatens Germany."

Great Britain.—Lord Northcliffe announces that he is about to begin a campaign to further his favorite policy of conscription. His plans, it is stated, have been carefully considered, and he intends to encourage public meetings and lecture courses which will excite the at-

Northcliffe and Conscription

tention of large sections of the provincial population, unacquainted with his publications. Despite the Premier's bitter opposition to this projected policy, there can be little doubt that conscription seems nearer than it did six months ago; Lord Northcliffe claims the hearty support of many important persons, including members of the Cabinet. Several Ministers have said that they would not oppose conscription should its necessity be shown, and it is thought that Lord Northcliffe's chief support will come from Mr. Lloyd George. However this may be, it seems certain, that in the opinion of a majority of the Cabinet, the voluntary enlistment system has by no means proved a failure. In point of fact, it is nearer the truth to say that it has brought in more men than the Government can equip. Just how many citizens Great Britain has under arms, has never been announced officially. Kitchener, and Lloyd George himself, has said more than once that the returns were "satisfactory," pleading the while, for more recruits; Lord Davenport, speaking in the House of Lords, estimated that 3,000,000 men had joined the colors; more recently, Lord Lansdowne has stated that less than half a million men were at the firing line. It seems clear then, that the bulk of the army is still under training. Many have been sent to the Dardanelles; a much larger number are in France, anxious to be sent to the front, but detained, perhaps indefinitely as things now seem, by want of ammunition and heavy guns. As an outsider views the situation, what Great Britain needs is not men but guns. Anything like compulsory service, either in the army or in the

ammunition works, is bound to be distasteful to the English temperament; but if conscription must come, it should be a force that will put workers in the munition factories. Army recruiting will take care of itself. Lord Northcliffe's motives, it may be said, are not above suspicion. His friends regard him as a patriot, bent on a plan which by calling into play the whole might of Great Britain, can alone save the country. Others there are, however, who denounce him as a selfish meddler, plotting the downfall of the present Cabinet, out of motives that are purely personal and thoroughly selfish.

Mexico.—American citizens living in Mexico have been driven to desperation. Through the Brazilian Minister they have forwarded to the State Department in Washington an appeal in which they beg for help for themselves and for some practical measures of relief to the country. The document reveals the frightful conditions in the Mexican capital, and implores our Government to act promptly. It runs:

The American residents of Mexico appeal once more to their Government and people in behalf of the suffering millions of pacific men, women and children in this country who are victims of hunger and cruelty and violence. These conditions put the gravest and most pressing responsibility upon the United States, which not only has passively permitted them, but has promoted them with arms and ammunition and by encouragement to political adventurers who have prostituted the name of liberty and the cause of human rights.

Americans and other foreigners stand aghast and wonder whether they can be living in the twentieth century and in a country bordering on the United States, which has made itself responsible to the world for protection of life and property here and yet does nothing more than send repeated warnings that are derided by half-savage men, drunk with ill-gotten power and the spirit of graft and hate.

For many months the Americans here, driven almost to desperation, have tried to bring their Government to a realization of the awful situation and begged that the American people be informed. Their request, long denied, was finally conceded in part by the President in his own statement of June 2 reciting briefly the conditions in Mexico.

These conditions, then hardly endurable, are much worse now, and the apparent inactivity of the Government at Washington fills Mexico with despair. There is not even a semblance of government here at the capital and we are living on a smoldering volcano. The entire City Council has been imprisoned without cause. We have seen three changes of armed government in thirty days. There is no communication with the world, except by special messengers.

The effort, it continues, of men trying to convince the world that Mexico is not hungry and Red Cross work not needed is deplored. The number of deaths from lack of food is declared to be increasing. The efforts of Special Commissioner O'Connor to relieve the distress by getting food in are dwelt upon, but it is declared that he has not yet succeeded in bringing a pound of food into the capital or to receive even a message from Washington regarding the work.

Mention is made of the seizure by the authorities of the *Mexican Herald*, the only English periodical left in the city. The appeal concludes:

The few reports coming from outside the capital nearly all show the same conditions of distress. If something is not done

by the United States or other foreign governments to open communications, supply food and stop the killing of men, outraging of women and destruction of property, there will be still graver complications for the world to settle in Mexico. The breaking point has been reached where foreigners who have long counseled self-restraint are getting desperate because of what they see around them and what they suffer themselves.

That the Americans in Mexico base their appeal on just grounds is corroborated by the following letter written by a recent refugee from Mexico, whose testimony is unimpeachable:

**Plunder and
Violence**

To the Editor of AMERICA:

From my preceding letter, describing, as this present one will, the political conditions in Mexico, you can understand my reasons for stating that not a single one of the contending factions exercises the slightest influence on the views and opinions of reasonable and fair-minded men. These show no favor or sympathy to the revolutionists. In their eyes, they are all outlaws, vying with one another in license and crime. Such is the verdict of the better class in Mexico. From what follows you can see for yourself that the salient acts of the administration of the various factions only confirm this general opinion.

And first as to the administration of Carranza. After his rupture with Villa and the Aguascalientes Convention, Carranza withdrew to Vera Cruz. By his orders, the latter city was made the capital of the Republic. At that very moment, his favorite of the hour, Candido Aguilar, was transferring his capital to Orizaba, thus depriving Jalapa of its constitutional rights. The City of Mexico remained the capital of the State of the Valley of Mexico formed almost entirely from the old Federal District.

After this first arbitrary measure, Carranza decreed the "Emancipation of Woman," by a law which made divorce legal throughout the entire country. And the decree was made still more odious by the indecent attacks on womanly modesty and conjugal fidelity in the preamble to the Bill.

By a third decree, the First Chief ordered all the ports of the Republic closed to foreign commerce, with the one exception of the port of Vera Cruz. At the same time he considerably raised the tariffs on exports which henceforth had to be paid in gold. The profits thus accruing to Carranza are evident. He issues paper-money and harvests gold for himself and his followers.

Certain banks in Cuba and the United States could easily furnish a balance-sheet of the capital invested by them for Carranza and his lieutenants.

Later on when Obregón was playing the tyrant in the City of Mexico, there came a fourth decree. The government offices and departments were to be transferred to Vera Cruz. Every day for some time, train after train left the old capital carrying off every object of value from the various bureaus of the government. With my own eyes I have seen men taking away from one of the principal offices of the "Palace," not only desks and bookshelves, but even cuspidors, telephones and electric light fixtures, down to the very push-buttons. But don't imagine that everything arrived safely at Vera Cruz. The Carranzista leaders, accustomed to pillage and plunder were not the men to be so nice and scrupulous. And what were the secret instructions given by the Carranza Administration to Alonso Obregón while the latter held his rule of terror in the former capital? He was to make it pay dearly for its lack of sympathy toward the revolution. The news was spread broadcast that flour, vegetables, cereals, the necessities of life in a word, were absolutely needed in the city. The neighboring planters and farmers, still in possession of such food-stuffs, and allured

by the high prices offered, asked passes from the Government for safe and free transportation. The Government agreed; freight-cars loaded with provisions rolled into the sheds. There everything was confiscated by the authorities, the freight shipped to Vera Cruz, so that Carranza might export it all to the United States in exchange for ammunition and arms. And not an explanation, not a cent of indemnity was offered to the owners. But it was loudly trumpeted in the Government papers, that his Excellency, General A. Obregón, deeply moved by the sufferings of the people, was studying the best means to remedy their woes. And what were the means? He openly said in various interviews given to the reporters, that since the poor were hungry and the rich refused to help them, he would not object if the famished people laid violent hands on whatever they needed wherever found; that his soldiers would not fire a shot if the wealthy were robbed and plundered; that it was an act of justice which nothing or nobody might prevent or forbid.

And the rich, so they were called, were in the same condition as the poor. They also needed food. Obregón would not let it reach them, but forwarded it as we have seen, to Carranza. Was there ever such hypocrisy and injustice? I do not speak of the decrees that flung so many Catholic priests into prison, nor of the wrongs and outrages inflicted on our most prominent business men. All that is too well known. Be it enough to say that Obregón went so far as to withdraw all police protection at night, so that the city might be left to the mercy of a lawless and frenzied mob. A certain Gerardo Murillo stirred up the passions of the well-known socialist and anarchistic club of the "Casa del Obrero Mundial," urging the members to rob and plunder the mansions of the rich. Thank God! The plot almost completely failed. I say "almost." For in the end they plundered the Jesuit Church of St. Bridget, the Academy and Convent of the "Josefinas," the Church of the Incarnation and a few others. It was a pitiable and fearful sight. At 11.30 a. m., protected by Obregón's cavalry, these lawless men sacked and plundered everything in one of the most prominent quarters of the city. From the Academy of the "Josefinas" they carried away furniture, carpets, curtains, lamps, etc., everything they could seize. In the Jesuit Church of St. Bridget they mutilated the statues of the Sacred Heart and St. Anthony, broke to pieces the crucifix, and the adoring angels keeping guard over the tabernacle. But wonderful to say, after all the pillage and plunder, the statue of one of the angels, the head of which had been broken off, still stood there bearing in his hands the Scriptures, on which could be clearly read an eloquent warning to those who attempted to destroy the house of God. When, after the retreat of Obregón, the church was restored to public worship, the statue was placed in the vestibule, a reminder to him and his like that heaven and earth shall pass away but the words and the promises of God shall not pass away!

A. COROLLA.

As a result of the conference held in New York by Secretary of State Lansing and the representatives of six Latin American republics, a note was sent to the Mexican leaders August 14. After stating that in the recent conference, the various diplomats were "inspired by the most sincere spirit of American fraternity," "convinced that they rightly interpret the earnest wish of the entire continent"; after reminding them that:

*Pan-American
Note*

In the heat of the frightful struggle which for so long has steeped in blood the Mexican soil, doubtless all may well have lost sight of the dissolving effects of the strife upon the most

vital conditions of the national existence, not only upon the life and liberty of the inhabitants, but on the prestige and security of the country.

After expressing the hope that each and every one of the contending leaders

measuring in his own conscience his share in the responsibilities of past misfortune and looking forward to his share in the glory of the pacification and reconstruction of the country, will respond, nobly and resolutely, to this friendly appeal and give their best efforts to opening the way to some saving action, the note finally comes to the point and says:

We, the undersigned, believe that if the men directing the armed movements in Mexico—whether political or military chiefs—should agree to meet, either in person or by delegates, far from the sound of cannon, and with no other inspiration save the thought of their afflicted land, there to exchange ideas and to determine the fate of the country—from such action would undoubtedly result the strong and unyielding agreement requisite to the creation of a provisional government, which should adopt the first steps necessary to the constitutional reconstruction of the country and to issue the first and most essential of them all, the immediate call to general elections.

An adequate place within the Mexican frontiers, which for the purpose might be neutralized, should serve as the seat of the conference, and in order to bring about a conference of this nature the undersigned, or any of them, will willingly, upon invitation, act as intermediaries to arrange the time, place and other details of such conference, if this action can in any way aid the Mexican people.

The undersigned expect a reply to this communication within a reasonable time, and consider that such a time would be ten days after the communication is delivered, subject to prorogation for cause.

But Carranza and his chiefs are reported to be still working for recognition and preparing to resist by force of arms any external interference.

From private and entirely reliable sources we have gathered the following data with regard to the tyrannous conduct of the revolutionists in Yucatan. Up to

*Yucatan and
Liberty*

a recent date the States of the Mexican Republic had been forced to submit to the odious yoke of the "First Chief." Yucatan, however, had escaped. That State was peaceful, law-abiding and flourishing. Its people imagined that their generous contributions, their submission to the recognized government, their abstention from political strife and their patience under the most cruel outrages would be their best protection against further wrongs. They were mistaken. There were two grievous charges against them. They were Catholics and they were prosperous. Their doom was sealed. But Yucatan decided to strike before falling. A leader appeared in Abel Ortiz Argumedo, a partisan of Carranza, but unwilling to share in his lawlessness and cruelties. He freed Merida from Carranza's yoke of terrorism, and was everywhere hailed with enthusiasm. Carranza's forces took the offensive, and Argumedo and his poorly-armed troops were powerless. The First Chief was again victorious. But Yucatan had not tamely yielded. Its bold stand for liberty and law deserves to be better known.

TOPICS OF INTEREST

The Collapse of Socialism

RECENTLY in the columns of AMERICA, Mr. G. K. Chesterton, has mordantly expressed the inconsistencies of the Socialists. He doubts if there are any Socialists left. I share the doubt with him. In recent controversies with devotees of the movement our arguments would quickly terminate for the prime reason that I could not persuade the hostile forces to agree on what Socialism *was*. Some, and these a dwindling number, had swallowed Marx whole and spat the fellow out with venom; others injected into the dispute the "rights" and wrongs of the Jews in Russia, twaddle about the "emancipation of women," whatever that may mean, and other weird inconsistencies, which ended in my coming to the unwelcome conclusion that a large proportion of my fellow-men, and especially women, shared in that decay of clear thinking, that deliquescence of the intellect, which is the outstanding feature of our time. When the historian of the future describes the many ills of our society, the vast political corruption and atrocities of our economic organization, the stress, the main stress, of his description of our feeble era, as all atheist eras must be feeble, will be on that utter forgetfulness of the meaning of words, which, in philosophy, has given us Pragmatism, and in physical science hypotheses for facts. The modern thinker would give us counters for coin.

I may be wrong, and, if so, I stand to be corrected, but my thought is that words came into being to express facts and ideas. If you fall over a fact it is well to have a word to describe that fact. The word in itself is of no value, a mere plaything when separated from the object it was created to describe. The natural corollary is this: when you have a word that describes well an idea, hold to it, grip it fast! Do not loosen your mind and allow it to catch on to some other fact or ideas. Do not let it perch itself in mid-air without a meaning, as words of their own nature will. Or, what is surely the worst thing that can befall a word, do not let it mean five or six things at the same time. If you once allow such unlimited freedom to a word you will find it sticking its letters in your face at all times, and usurping the places of other words in an arrogant manner, confusing you and generally playing the devil with your philosophy. Indeed, you will soon lose the control of words, and then control of yourself; and you will end as a Pragmatist, or fail to make necessary preparations for war, or become a politician—or endure some other fearsome fate.

To take an example of the way in which words escape from the control of your modern thinker. Take the word "progress." In its modern usage this expression has caused more wreckage of the intellect, created more intellectual driftwood than any other word that I can, for the moment, think of. It is clear to minds better adjusted

for purposes of sane thought than those idols of the moment in modern philosophical circles, that the word progress can mean something only in reference to some aim definitely expressed. Bear in mind, I pray you, that this word progress bears no moral meaning. The aim expressed need not necessarily be a good aim. A labor union official may sincerely desire to work for the strengthening of his union, or he may merely desire to make money out of his job. Once you know his aim, in either case you may say he has progressed or has not progressed according to whether he benefits his union or not, or whether his bank account is increased or not. But to use the word progress as it is constantly used today, without mentioning the object in view, is to talk sheer nonsense and to express nothing. To call a political party the "Progressive Party" is to make an end to language, nay, to all thinking. The word progress is loose, playing horrid tricks with your "radical" thinker, your "radical" politician, your "radical" apologist for loose morals for woman and for the prevention of conception. The word is at large, attached to neither fact nor idea, and we poor devils of the pen who care for clear thought must chase it up hill and down dale, o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent till we run it down, and bind it to its proper meaning for the proper uses of mankind.

To return to Socialism. Let me give an example of the inability of Socialists to define clearly their own creed. An able English writer published a challenge in a London weekly in which he stated that he doubted if, outside the stalwart band of Marxists of the Social Democratic Federation, now amalgamated with the "British Socialist Party," there were many people who were still Socialists. A Socialist daily paper of London realizing the quality of the challenge asked its readers to give their opinions on his statement. The opinions were duly given and proved the statement to be quite correct. While all duly clung to the title of Socialist, they more or less unanimously added that nothing in the world would induce them to hand over "the means of production and exchange" to the State. Here, then, we have another attempt to destroy the usefulness of words. Indeed, the reply of the challenger lay along these lines.

He pointed out that there is a certain economic and political theory on behalf of which strong arguments have been and can be urged. It is this: that the only permanent solution of the social problems will be achieved by taking the means of production from the private persons who are at present their legal owners and vesting them in the political officers of the State that may administer them for the benefit of the whole community. That theory is called Socialism. If you believe in the theory it is natural and proper that you should be fond of the name. But that any one's affection for the name should survive his belief in the theory, as it quite evidently does in many cases, is almost impossible to believe.

But that is not the main point to emphasize. The main point is this. The theory still exists and still demands a name. If you deprive it of the name it has always borne you commit an act of pure waste; and you do not in this case or any similar case, even justify your action by making any valuable use of the name you have stolen. If a Socialist does not mean a man who wishes the State to own the means of production, what does it mean? As to that the new "Socialists" seem somewhat vague. Sometimes it seemed to mean a man discontented with existing social conditions, that is, a man who is neither a knave nor an ignoramus. I can only say that when I called myself a Socialist I meant by Socialism something explicit, definable and distinctive, and I am quite certain that until it again means something as explicit, definable and distinctive it will be no use preaching it.

Thus we discover the collapse of Socialism to be due in the main to one thing: its inability to remain truly socialistic in the face of that criticism which has its origin in Catholic thought. Socialists still fondly cling to a term, which in the use they have put it to, has no meaning. They are wantonly destroying the use of a word for the sake of a sentiment.

LOUIS H. WETMORE.

Defects of the Catholic Press

THE last three Popes have given the most generous encouragement to the Catholic press, and rightly, for it is, or can be, a tremendous weapon of the Faith. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in Europe. Each of the larger countries proudly boasts its Catholic daily, there are many cultured and stimulating weeklies, while sober and scholarly fortnightly and monthlies play their part in the defense of religion and the furthering of the Catholic cause.

When we turn to America we find the journalistic field in a condition truly lamentable. No Catholic daily exists and, for the matter of that, geographical reasons account for its absence. For the rest one might truthfully say the Catholic press does not exist. The number of even readable Catholic weeklies can be counted on the fingers of one hand; we have one excellent fortnightly, and two, or shall we say three, monthlies can be dignified with the name of magazine.

This is sad but true. At the the same time it does not mean that journalistic enterprise is lacking. On the contrary, it is obtrusively present and we poor Catholics are expected to support an Egyptian plague of ill-edited, illiterate and un-American sheets, without either policy or news, papers which if they appealed to any but a Catholic public would die of inanition in a month. The existence of these papers is a reproach to the Church and an insult to the intelligence of the Catholics of America. The low intellectual tone which marks the majority of them is heartbreaking. Let us be modest and say that Catholics have at least as much intelligence as the average man or woman among their fellow-citizens, but to judge from

these sheets one would think that we were incapable of assimilating the easiest of predigested mental breakfast-foods.

These are harsh words, but what is the use of blinking facts? We all know it, but none of us dare say so for fear of being called disloyal. We have said that the Catholic press, so-called, was ill-edited, illiterate and un-American. One does not have to prove these points, these adjectives rise unbidden at the sight of the average paper, but let us take an example or two.

One paper comes to mind which week by week publishes "Helpful Hints for Our Young Men." Admirable! No. A mere waste of space, for the "Hints" consist of a column of mawkish sentimentality which would nauseate any young fellow of normal manly instincts. If that editor knew his job he would know that "our young men" simply will not read the sort of stuff that a spinster of forty-five might write. Here is one of the secrets of the lack of influence found in the Catholic press. Bad editing! Yet there are any number of capable Catholic editors, the journalistic woods are full of them, and they can be found anywhere but on a Catholic paper. The reason?—well, we'll deal with that later on, and just remark in passing that "you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." A seminarian with a "spoilt" vocation; a barber turned printer; a "medico" without patients, or a busy priest with a large parish, are all of them admirable people in their own way, but they certainly are not journalists in the technical sense of the term. With the best will in the world they will fail in journalism, Catholic or secular. Now we have put our finger on the spot. Unless we get trained men to run our papers we might just as well have none at all. No one can deny that what we are pleased to call "our Catholic editors" are really one or other of two things. Either they are amiable amateurs—and to this class most but, thank God, not all our clerical editors belong—or they are failures in the art of journalism. No one can deny it. The result of of it all is this, that they fall back upon their assistant editors, "Mr. Shears" and "Mr. Paste," and eke out a miserable existence by stealing one another's thunder, usually without acknowledgment. When they do by any miraculous chance write anything original we get some delightful samples of how crass ignorance can be. Take one amusing example:

One scribe—it would be uncharitable to state into which editorial category he fell—selected the Divine Office as a subject for mirth, and incidentally let fall some caustic remarks on the suffragettes, based on the antiphon containing the words: *Intercede pro devoto femineo sexu*. This the brilliant scholar translated "the devout female sex" in blissful ignorance that *devotus* has never meant "devout," but always "under vows," i. e., nuns. Think of it! Yes, it actually occurred, and the point of the joke is that the Latinist was corrected by a suffragette! But to pass to more serious things.

The un-American character of our Catholic papers—

and this applies to all of them, good and bad—is a serious mistake. They are un-American because they appeal to the “Hyphen.” It matters not what hyphen it is, any appeal to race or to politics is out of place in a Catholic paper, which should appeal to Catholics as such whether they be of Irish, German, Chinese, or Patagonian descent.

The worst offenders in this respect are those which, directly or indirectly, are forever raising the question of Ireland's freedom. This is a perfectly good issue in its proper place, and there are excellent weeklies devoted to the cause of Ireland, but it cannot be too emphatically stated that right thinking on the subject of Irish politics is not synonymous with Catholic orthodoxy, despite the Canadian priest who was once bold enough to say so. This being the case it should be discussed at length anywhere but in distinctively Catholic journals.

Its absence would no doubt leave a great blank in many of our papers, but there is much to be said to fill it. One of the legitimate functions of the press is criticism and, with those brave few exceptions that prove the rule, no Catholic paper in America ever dares open its mouth on any one of those very obvious questions which need ventilation. None of us is either infallible or impeccable.

All this, however, is destructive criticism. What can and what should be done? What we need is organization. Don't let us blind ourselves to the fact. For the lack of it American Catholics, for all their sixteen millions, are the most inchoate community in the world. It may be doubted if we have any leaders, but, if we have, they should get together and suppress at one stroke the horde of “official organs” and others which now call themselves Catholic papers.

The country should then be divided up into sections, each capable of supporting in the financial sense a well-edited paper. About ten or twelve of these sections is all that are needed and the Catholic population of such divisions would be large enough to ensure the success of what would really be “official organs.” The financial returns would enable the authorities to engage good editors, there are scores of them, who in turn could get their material from Catholic writers of talent, there are hundreds of them, and so our few Catholic weeklies would be bright, newsy, and intelligent, a pleasure to read and not a duty to support.

N. Y. E.

The Young Man and Stock Raising*

SUCCESSFUL work in stock raising demands as a prime requisite a love of animals. To know them one must love and understand them. There is an old German adage, “The eye of the master fattens his cattle.” Therefore the young man who thinks of this sort of career as a life work must make himself thoroughly

familiar with agriculture and country life with all that this implies. Then, if he is still satisfied and sure of himself, there is no better field in which to spend one's days than in the field of animal husbandry and stock raising.

The field is broad, offering plenty of opportunities to young men in all circumstances with and without capital. It conveniently separates itself into two natural divisions: the field of practical farm and estate management either for oneself or for others, and the scientific study of breeding and feeding looking toward teaching and research.

The former sort of work demands first of all a long apprenticeship under practical men who have given their lives to the improvement of livestock. To get the most out of this apprenticeship a boy should grow up on a good stock farm, where he will gradually learn all that is necessary without great effort. Then he should supplement this with a four years' course in a college of agriculture, specializing in animal husbandry subjects during his last year. The best training and results never seem to come by the reverse process, that is, high school and college first and practical experience afterwards. To have the greatest success in breeding, growing and finishing stock, the first principles must come from contact with the animals themselves. The best caretakers live more or less with their animals. This can be done with no loss of self-respect and simply entails close observation of the animals day by day.

To go into stock raising for oneself requires considerable capital, but if a boy already lives on a farm and can work and cooperate with his father, the lack of a large amount of capital is not a serious handicap. The formulation of an ideal is necessary first of all: steadiness of purpose will bring about the realization of that ideal. Nor is a four years' course of training wholly necessary. The boy who can go no further than high school can secure employment on a high-class stock farm and gradually work up to the place where he himself will have charge of the feeding, breeding and management of the flock or herd that he loves. But at least a two years' special course in college in place of the last two years' high school, or a two years' course in a secondary school of agriculture, is highly desirable in order to form a proper ideal. That ideal must include the principle that no stockman can afford to be in the stock raising business today with anything except pure-bred, registered stock. This may not be attainable at first, but can be gradually realized.

A striking instance of this is shown in the herd of dairy cattle in the Animal Husbandry Department of one of the best agricultural colleges in the United States. About twenty-five years ago there was in the college herd one pure-bred female, poor in quality, worth perhaps \$100. Today there are in that herd fifty or sixty fine, pure-bred animals, all descended from this one female, which are a delight to the eye and a source of

*The thirty-eighth of a series of vocational articles.

the greatest satisfaction to the person who has been responsible all these years for their breeding. Four of the middle-aged animals in this herd are worth \$1,500 each because of their great productive ability. No female stock has been purchased in all these years. Such a record, of course, is attainable only as a result of singleness of purpose and a high ideal. Any young man can duplicate this record on the home farm if he will familiarize himself with the few principles involved, cling to his ideal, and know and love his animals.

A concrete example of how a farm boy has "made good" in this way may be cited. This young man at the age of perhaps thirty-five years is now the general manager of one of the largest and finest Jersey stock farms in the world. He was a farm boy with a good common school education finished and rounded out with two years at one of the leading agricultural colleges of the country. At first he was the hog herdsman on this farm, then he went to another farm in a higher position, and finally went back to the first farm in the capacity of general manager of all the flocks and herds on the place. The two years' special work in college can be secured by the young man who is willing to work for what he can earn during vacation and while in college. Under no condition, however, can actual manual labor in direct contact with the animals themselves be neglected, if animals and their habits are to be known through and through.

Moreover, the city boy can succeed as well as his country cousin, as is evidenced in the case of a young man now on a large farm in northern New York. He has paid his way entirely since the second year in high school. He did not finish his high school work, but entered college as a special student. After earning his way here for two years the lack of practical farm training was apparent, and he is now securing that with one more year in college in view, when he will be well-prepared to take the position of herdsman and gradually work up to a satisfactory place commanding a good salary.

The other great division in this field is along the line of teaching and research. Very little is known of the principles of breeding and feeding farm animals. Here is a wonderful opportunity for the young man with a love for animals, and with a scientific turn of mind. The training that he must put himself through is similar to that of the other young man who is fitting himself wholly for practical work, and while it is not correct to say that it must be more thorough, it must be different. He will be a better scientist if he can have an apprenticeship of two or three years on a stock farm before beginning his technical education, for he will then be able to grapple more easily with the fundamental problems in breeding and feeding.

While the man who is to be the practical raiser of stock out on the farm is rounding out his experience in actually feeding and caring for his herds and flocks the scientist in this field must be spending his time in the laboratories of school or college. In the second division

of this field of endeavor the time of the training period will probably be longer and it will be somewhat harder to pay one's way, yet the opportunity here is great and the chance for success is sure.

In stock raising either practically on farms or, on the scientific side, in teaching and laboratory work, one is dealing with living, growing things and with principles that show why these animals live and grow and produce food, clothing and labor for human beings. It is this touch with the fundamental principles of life itself that makes this line of work so interesting and satisfactory. At the same time the young man, who by persistent effort puts himself with the leaders, will not lack for proper recognition and proper remuneration for his labor.

Cornell University.

ELMER S. SAVAGE.

A Scandalized Contemporary

THE *Living Church* has a particularly bitter article in its issue of July 31, in reference to certain marriages that have taken place lately in the Catholic Church. We think we know the reason of this bitterness. It is usually manifested after an important conversion from the ranks of the Anglican clergy has been announced. Such an announcement has just been made. The Reverend Bernard Moultrie, a clergyman of thirty-two years standing, and one who was until recently the Warden of the best-known Anglican Community, has lately been received into the Catholic Church. It is the most noteworthy conversion since that of Father Maturin. The *Living Church* feels that it must do something to offset this victory for the enemy! The easiest thing to do is to attack the practical methods of Catholicism, for it is not hard to find scandals, or at least apparent cause for scandal, in the workings of a great system. This is the trump card of the *Menace*: the *Living Church* plays its game with a like astuteness. It has a large number of subscribers to appeal to, who are more or less ignorant of Catholicism, but who are favorably drawn toward it. By taking advantage of this ignorance a double purpose will be served. The Catholic Church will be vilified, and individuals who are considering its claims, will be deterred in their search for truth. So the *Living Church* proceeds to give to the world two instances of the alleged scandalous way in which divorced people can be *remarried* in the Catholic Church. The article resolves itself into a solemn protest, which is offered with sorrow and regret. "Alas, that things should be so!" it seems to say. We give some extracts to show its drift:

One of the discouragements which frequently come to those who earnestly desire that our Roman Catholic brethren should adequately portray to the world those Catholic ideals that alone give hope for the re-union of Christendom, is connected with the outrageous defiance of Christian ideals which so often attends the solemnization of holy matrimony by priests of that communion.

This is pretty strong. Two instances, as we said before, are given to prove that this statement is justified;

we have not the least intention of giving them a further publicity—and then after a homily on our duty in this matter, comes the protest:

Because we are Christians, because we are Catholics, because, being both, we share and ought to share, in the opprobrium which such an act brings upon the Christian religion and the Catholic Church, we protest against a system of canon law whereby such acts as these become possible.

The fact is that this is all solemn "buncombe," and we strongly suspect that the one who wrote it, knows that it is buncombe. At least, he knows, as every well-informed person knows, that *remarriage* after divorce is impossible in the Catholic Church. He also knows that the Canon Law of the Catholic Church is framed in the interests of humanity. Nothing would please him and his friends better than that the Episcopal Church should adopt the whole of this Canon Law just as it stands. The instances which may be cited from time to time, where it would appear that the law has been ineffective, are such as no law, however perfect, could avoid. They are hard cases, which must be dealt with in such a way as to avoid even greater evils. It would be interesting to know how the Anglican Church would handle them. As far as we can observe, the approved method is to allow ministers of other denominations to cut these difficult knots, and then when the marriages have been effected, to admit the parties concerned to the full privileges of communion. The Catholic Church does not deal with difficulties in this way. She faces each issue, and regardless of the cost, follows her system to the letter, knowing that her long experience with humanity, and the promised guidance of the Holy Ghost will order things for the highest benefit of mankind.

We recommend that the *Living Church* should make itself further acquainted with Canon Law before making such portentous protests. It will not be necessary to read Catholic books to do so. Dr. Mortimer wrote a popular treatise on theology called "Catholic Faith and Practice." It is safe to say that a copy of this work may be found in the library of every High Church clergyman. The chapters on "Holy Matrimony" are practically word for word a restatement of the very Canon Law that is protested against. In them will be found a full discussion of the various impediments that render marriages invalid. And, of course, it is hardly necessary to say, that it is because so many invalid marriages take place today, that opportunities are created for so-called remarriages. If a protest must be made, let it be made against invalid marriages. Who is to blame for them? Certainly not the Catholic Church, which is often criticised for the seemingly unnecessary formalities that must be gone through before any marriage ceremony can be performed by a priest. It is not her fault, for instance, that unbaptized and baptized persist in marrying. It is not her fault that foolish young couples run away from home and attempt to enter the marriage state by all kinds of illegal and un-Christian methods. Who is to

blame for this? We think we can put our finger on one real culprit. The chief one to blame for clandestine marriages is the minister, who either on account of respect of persons, or else vulgar love of money, is willing to marry any one who applies to him, be they baptized, unbaptized, members of his church, or total strangers. As long as ministers do these things, so long will there be divorces, and consequent remarriages.

In almost every case in which the Catholic Church has to bear the brunt of criticism in the matter of marriage of divorcees, it will be found that the difficulty has been created by an invalid marriage in the first instance, due either to the laxity of the civil law, or to the willingness of Protestant ministers to marry any one who asks them.

What is to be done? Must the Church lower her standards? That she has a high standard in the matter of marriage, no one but a bigot would deny. Must she accept every marriage of any kind as lawful and valid, and thereby admit that either the State, or a hundred varying sects have the right to decide who may, or who may not enter upon matrimony? Has she no authority as the representative of God to place lawful impediments by way of preventing monstrous evils? Are we to sacrifice our ordered system that has stood the test of centuries, and adopt that chaos to which the marriage methods of Anglicanism are reduced, because a few hard cases may be cited, which we did not create, but are trying to deal with prudently?

The *Living Church* suggests an alternative. The guilty parties who have knowingly contracted an invalid matrimony, should be put under penance, before being allowed to marry lawfully. Shall we say why this would be impossible? It would be impossible as long as there are Protestant ministers who would welcome the opportunity to break down any such penitential system. The practical result of an attempt to enforce such a discipline would be this: the parties concerned would merely leave the priest's house, and go over the street to the parsonage, and there obtain what had been denied them. For remember that in hard cases like these, you are not dealing, for the most part, with exemplary members of the Christian family, but with those who, having done wrong in the first place, are very likely to do the same again.

EDWARD HAWKS.

Why Are Our Children "Different"?

"WHY are boys and girls so different now from what they were when I was a girl?"

"Are they different?" I asked, for I was somewhat taken by surprise. Besides I was conscious of a feeling that the best answer to the question could probably be given by the lady who was asking it, for she is the mother of several growing boys and girls, and has a keen intelligence of her own.

"Why, yes," she replied. "Haven't you noticed it?"

"Well—yes." I hesitated. "But I imagined that the trouble was with me."

She paused a moment as though gathering stray thoughts

together, and then went on more certainly. "Perhaps I exaggerate a little, but I cannot help thinking that it isn't just right for children to be growing into men and women with ideas and impulses that seem so strange and unwholesome to their mother. I may be a bit old-fashioned, or maybe their growing so big makes me feel old, and think old, too, so that I have got a little behind, and ought to be quite willing to let Virginia and Harry and Tom and Mary set the pace."

She caught me smiling, and said, "Why do you smile?"

"Frankly," I answered, "because it seemed funny to have you suggest letting boys and girls who are not yet out of high school set the pace."

"But from my point of view it's not funny," she replied. "I'm beginning to feel that the children expect me to do it, and I know several women of my own age who are already letting their boys and girls do that very thing. In fact, one of the favorite arguments in the house now is that Mrs. Smith or Mrs. Jones lets Sam or Molly do something that my children are proposing."

"That must be rather troublesome when you have different ideas of your own," I suggested.

"Indeed it is," she answered. "Especially when it has the effect of making you wonder whether you are wrong and Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Jones are right. Perhaps I shouldn't be so much bothered if it weren't that I am sure there is something about my boys and girls I do not quite understand, something I am certain never was in us when we were their age, and that I never expected to find in children of mine."

"That sounds rather astonishing," I observed with a laugh. "I should be very much interested to hear what this strange thing is."

"It seems to me to be a combination of several things in them," she said quietly. "If they were older I should call it their attitude toward life. Of course, I know it's only natural for children to love pleasure, and I'm sure I do all I can to make mine happy; but what worries me is that they don't seem to think they should bother much about anything else but having a good time. For instance, the fact that I think they shouldn't go to more than one party or theater in a week seems unreasonable to them, especially if they are able to point out that their lessons are all done, or that there is no particular reason, except my old-fashioned rule, that they shouldn't go."

"Do you mean to say that they expect some kind of entertainment every week," I interrupted, "and that they think you old-fashioned even when you allow so much? I begin to understand why you are a little bewildered."

"I am rather amazed sometimes," she answered, "not so much at their wanting to have what they call a good time, as at their being really earnest and serious about almost nothing else. They have always got to be amused; they don't seem to know how to amuse themselves. If I were a girl again, and my girls were neighbors, I'm sure I should not know what to do with them if they came to spend an evening with me in my old home."

"That's an amusing way to put it," I said, "but it surely makes the contrast stand out very clearly."

An expression of deep seriousness came upon her face. "What worries me most is this," she said earnestly, "they are very much set upon having their own way, and while they do not become exactly rebellious, they are, to say the least, extremely argumentative. They seem to think they have the right to decide things for themselves. They argue that all the boys and girls they know have their own way about lessons, and parties, and theaters, and clothes, and all the other things they are interested in. Of course, I know that in some ways I ought to be pleased with this and look on it

as being promising and self-reliant; and I might, too, if the tendency of what they are trying to do were not in a direction I don't want to see them moving in. Now I don't like to say it about my own children, but I may as well tell the truth, frankly. Everything they are so keen about doing appears to me to be some form or other of self-indulgence. And most of the boys and girls they know are the same. They want to have their own way, they seem to think they have a right to it, and with them, too, it's all in the one direction. That's what I meant when I asked why they are so different now from what boys and girls were in my day. I sometimes wonder what is wrong with the way I am bringing them up. I am sure that even though we didn't perhaps think about it very often, we had some sense of duty, and that we didn't feel free to argue with father or mother upon their opinions of what we should do. Indeed I don't think it priggish to say that we often got a good deal of satisfaction out of doing things or not doing things just because they were expected of us. I believe that even as children we had some sense of responsibility, and that we understood it was best for ourselves to do our duty, and to be guided and directed by older people. I really think I was happier than my girls are, and that on the whole we got much more pleasure out of the parties we had and the occasional theatrical performances we were allowed to attend than they do out of these constant good times they are always so busy about. I can't make out where this strange spirit comes from or how it has got such a hold on my boys and girls. It doesn't seem right, and I simply cannot account for it."

"I agree with you," I said, "that it doesn't seem right, and as for accounting for it, perhaps I can help you a little." I had been pondering deeply of late upon certain marked tendencies in our country's life, new directions given to social, political and educational development by new forms of very old human tendencies, and the serious talk of this earnest mother set me thinking that what she was complaining of was only another manifestation of the working of this same general force.

I went on: "Perhaps I shall seem a little pedantic in what I am going to say. However, I'll risk that in the hope that we may get some light on the question. At first I was surprised to hear that your children should show these tendencies, because I thought that in your home and in the Catholic schools they are attending they would be sufficiently protected, or I might say insulated, from the influences that would give them the ideas and impulses you are distressed to see in them. In my opinion, however, these things, as far as your children are concerned, are as yet only symptoms, not a disease. You may be sure that the trouble is not working in them without resistance. That much, even under the worst conditions, the Catholic training they are receiving in school and the influence of your home, would be certain to do for them. However, this strange spirit which you speak of seems to have made its first advances upon them, and I think I begin to understand why this should be so. Wordsworth said that "Heaven lies about us in our infancy," and while this may be true in a certain way and for a short time, I think he compressed much more of reality, at least present-day reality, in the line, "The world is too much with us."

"The world?" she questioned, somewhat amazed. "Why, my children are too young yet to know anything about the world!"

"The fact that they may not consciously know anything about the world," I replied, "gives no assurance that they are not being affected by it. Indeed, I question whether the influence the world has on them is not the most persistent and permanent of all the forces their minds and characters are

subject to. The very tendencies your children are showing prove conclusively to me that, however they come under the influence of life outside their home and school, it actually is this influence that is affecting them, for in their strong desire to have their own way, and in their eagerness to escape restraint and to have a good time, they are clear mirrors of the times. Do you realize what a pagan place the world has become? There seems to be a universal cult of unrestraint. The demand is for what is called the enfranchising of human nature, and what really is the licensing of human impulse. The Socialists are at it all the time. Every attempt toward the further secularization of education is a move in the same direction. Why, even under the appearance of charitable work, humanitarianism is, with a great many earnest people, supplanting religion. In dealing with crime, sentimentality is taking the place of justice. The whole tendency of the day is to get rid of responsibility and restraint."

"But my boys and girls know nothing of all this. They never have anything to do with Socialists, and they certainly do not read serious articles about secular education and crime."

"That's true," I responded quickly, "but they do read newspapers and stories in magazines; they do see plays at the theaters; they are always running to the 'movies.' They spend a great deal of their time in the company of other boys and girls who do attend secular schools, and whose fathers and mothers, even though they do not realize it, keep step with the world around them. I do not mean that anybody is definitely teaching them the doctrine of unrestraint, but I can see now very clearly how this doctrine is being taught them by suggestion, by almost everything that appeals to their interest and natural love of excitement and pleasure. Of course they see no danger in it, and are not conscious that anything is wrong. Every one around them seems to be doing the same thing, and the only thing that appears strange to them is that you, or anybody else, should suggest that for any reason they shouldn't join the procession."

"Dear me," she said sadly, "I always imagined that I had kept my children so safe. I've always sent them to Catholic schools, and I haven't given in to nearly all their demands. I wonder who is to blame?"

"Not the children," I answered, "nor you, nor their schools, that is, not yet. After all, the poison is in the very air they breathe."

"But is there no antidote?" she asked anxiously.

"Yes, I think there is," I answered quietly. "The antidote that suggests itself to me is, after all, not new: just plain Christianity. Perhaps there will be need of somewhat larger doses, and applications at unaccustomed places. It is evident that, since your children have got to live in this world, they cannot escape all its contacts; but in spite of this, a great deal can be done which perhaps is not being done now to keep them from becoming worldlings. In the first place, there are a great many worldly habits which they need not form. This much you can attend to yourself by standing firmly for real Christian discipline at home, first letting them see how good a reason you have for being what they call 'different from other people,' and making them understand that, to a certain extent, they must be content to be different, too. Then you must fortify them against the miasma the world is noxious with. They must have a constant prophylactic. I need not tell you that this should be the earnest, constant and regular practice of their religion. You can train them to that mostly at home, but you will have untold help from keeping them at their Catholic schools until their education is finished."

"That is exactly what I have always intended to do," she answered firmly, "and both they and I have been making good use of what you call the prophylactic. I am not quite so sure about Christian discipline in the home. Perhaps I have been a little off my guard, and somewhat disinclined to be thought too much different from other people."

"And yet being 'different,' in another sense, is the very thing that worries you about your boys and girls."

"That's true," she said, "and that's what makes me unhappy. Do you think I shall be able to influence them?"

"Undoubtedly," I answered with conviction. "Now that you have thought out, or talked out, what the trouble is, and understand so thoroughly the remedy, you will begin to see progress at once. Besides," I added earnestly, "you know you will not be working alone."

NELSON HUME, PH.D.,
Headmaster, Canterbury School.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule, should be limited to six hundred words.

Flowers and Funerals

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I am blamed by "Z. M.," in AMERICA of July 3, for opposing "a suggestion thoroughly Catholic" inasmuch as I contend for Masses and flowers instead of for Masses and no flowers. I consider no suggestion "thoroughly Catholic" that would needlessly take the bread out of an honest worker's mouth; and for that reason I opposed "A Layman's" suggestion. Especially did I resent it when I saw a group of "prominent" men calmly approving the suggestion, with apparently no thought of the many men and women to be affected by it. Every priest indeed is "specially chosen by God to foster the supernatural," among other things, the supernatural command of Christ to care for the poor. From the whole range of the New Testament, I can recall no duty more solemnly insisted on than that of relieving the bodily necessities of man, feeding him, clothing him, sheltering him, visiting him in his distress. Now before my critics accuse me of heresy for that statement, I charge them first to weigh it carefully, and then to open their Bibles, turn to St. Matthew, chap. xxv, and read from verse xxxii to verse xlv. They may rise from their perusal of that tremendous passage with more sympathy in their hearts for the poor of this world.

Those words of Our Lord in St. Matthew apply immediately to the relief of destitution, and I think they have some application also to its prevention, and that I am in line with them, and with other words of the Gospel, when I plead for the retention of a custom that means bread and butter to many honest workers, as well as consolation to many a sorrowing heart. Whether I be in accord with the current political economy, I care not a straw.

"Money is never wasted, 'A Priest' would have us believe, so long as someone profits by the expenditure," says "Z. M." Well, now! I said absolutely nothing to warrant such a charge. Any ordinary Christian could have seen that I was defending an honest business, not a worthless one. As to "money lavished on expensive gowns," "Z. M." might prefer to see society people clothed in sackcloth and ashes. So would Quaker theologians. Catholic theologians, however, would allow them to array themselves occasionally like "Solomon in all his glory," and an army of dressmakers and dry-goods clerks joyfully assent.

I favored "a whole roomful of flowers around the bier of the dead" (AMERICA, June 19), not the practice of placing "flowers upon the coffins of the dead" (AMERICA, June 26 and

July 3). But that's only a minor imputation. A graver one is this: "A Priest" seems convinced that all is as it should be as long as we are certain of the flowers and doubtful about the Masses." An ugly insinuation, founded solely in "Z. M.'s" fancy. The suggestion to make a comparative record of Mass offerings and floral offerings is impossible. Floral pieces are sent by friends without, as well as by friends within, the parish; and even if all the donors were members of our parish, I could not expect them, or most of them, to come to me. I have said Mass almost daily for years, and have hardly ever been without intentions, most of which, I believe, have been for the dead. The same is true of nearly all priests in this city. We send many intentions to priests in small country towns, where the people are not in the habit of making offerings for Masses, and I do not think they are in the habit of making floral offerings either. I doubt whether you will find floral shops in the villages of California. If some floral contributors are not in the habit of remembering the departed souls, all that one need do, I think, is to remind them of the practice, and they will adopt it. It's "in them" to give.

Finally, I confess that I may have been hasty in thinking that the florist's business was imperiled by "A Layman's" suggestion, as, at the time of my first communication, the thought of non-Catholic patronage never entered my head. I am not concerned with making the florist rich, but only with seeing him live decently. Hence, if his livelihood would not be materially affected by a withdrawal of Catholic patronage, and if the consolation which flowers give to the bereaved could be neglected, I would stand with the anti-floral correspondents for Masses and no flowers.

San Francisco.

A PRIEST.

[This controversy is closed.—Editor AMERICA.]

Ben Jonson as a Catholic

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your correspondent, H. C. Watts, feels aggrieved at an article in AMERICA of July 31, entitled "A Curiosity of English Literature," and in voicing his grievance does really, I think, perpetrate another literary curiosity himself. His grounds of complaint are two: the first is that I allude to Jonson as a Catholic, whereas Jonson was, or became, an apostate. Now, in point of fact, the offending article describes this poet precisely as Mr. Watts describes him: as a Catholic, and as an apostate. "He was a Catholic temporarily," but "he shook off his Catholicism when he shook off his shackles," and indeed the whole point of the paragraph about the man turned on his defection from the Church. Is it, therefore, not a curiosity that Mr. Watts could protest so indignantly against a contributor who agrees with him so harmoniously? *Quidquid negat alter, et alter; annuimus pariter.*

Secondly, Mr. Watts grieves that "in (my) anxiety to prove that there is a strain of Catholicism in English poetry" I should have mentioned the name of Jonson at all. How it ever entered into the mind of your correspondent that I was endeavoring in my article to indicate the Catholic strain in English poetry is an inscrutable mystery, and is the second curiosity of his letter. The paper recorded a single fact, curious, as it appeared to me, viz., that the most representative poet in every period of English literature for 200 years came under the spell of the Catholic Church. One of these leaders was Ben Jonson, yet I was careful to explain that he, having been a Catholic for a brief period only and having afterwards abjured the Faith, could not be cited as a satisfactory example, although my contention was literally true even in his case, since he had entered within the Church's pale. If I had been anxious, as Mr. Watts conceives, to mention the

names of the representative Catholic writers in English poetry, God forbid that I should have named Jonson, or yet Pope, for whose piety as a Catholic I have no esteem, or Dryden, for whose piety I have but little more, or Shakespeare, of whose piety I am profoundly skeptical. God forbid that I should have omitted the name of Southwell, my own Jesuit brother, or Heywood, whom I might call my Jesuit foster-father, or Habington, or Shirley, or many others vastly more Catholic than any names recorded in the article. Yet the former I named and not the latter for the simple reason that I was setting forth not the names of great Catholics who were English poets, but the names of great poets who were Catholics; a very different thing.

Let me trust that my friend, the enemy, will realize how fraternal is our agreement on these points, and that to do so the better he will read the article in question *after* having criticized it.

Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

F. M. CONNELL, S.J.

Votes for Women

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Since an Irishman has leave to speak twice I feel that you will graciously accord the same privilege to a daughter of the race. My plea for the suffragists should have been one for women in general—the so-called "New Woman"—in particular. It requires great courage to open AMERICA week after week with the knowledge that either in the editorials or elsewhere, a sound rating is to be her portion. Warriors among us fortified by a legacy of unutterable gentleness handed down for our consolation through the Gospels, gaily renew our subscriptions and continue to read and rejoice, while the truly feminine—well, I am not prepared to say how the scoldings affect their minds. As to my sisters, the suffragists, I have already had the pleasure of hearing them called upon from the pulpit to register in order to exercise their right to vote. The day is surely coming when the Church will have reason to bless those Catholic women who have worked for, and helped to win, equal suffrage in the United States.

Though highly honored at seeing my little prayer for mercy in print, I must beg you not to pursue me with your eloquent pen. I might have courage enough to die for an ideal, provided there be no preliminary tortures, but I have neither the energy nor the brains to hold my own in an argument with the distinguished editor of AMERICA.

Spokane, Washington.

M. M. C.

[This gentle daughter of Eve, fed on the meekness of the Gospel, has been misled into thinking that AMERICA opposes votes for women. AMERICA is opposed to suffragettes, their preachment of stupid and sometimes immoral doctrines, their antics now as "warriors" astride horses, now on the hustings, now in the "ring." Vote, ladies, if you can and will, but before and during and after the voting protect yourselves from the suffragettes "working toward the realization of their perfect selves."—Editor AMERICA.]

Protest of an Anglo-Catholic

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mr. Moore's letter in AMERICA of July 17 greatly interested me. He insisted strongly on the sincerity of Anglo-Catholics. Might I state that sincerity is no criterion of truth? The Methodist, Presbyterian and Christian Scientist, are equally sincere in their beliefs; and yet the Anglo-Catholic must not only condemn their doctrines, but must oppose and attack them fearlessly. In like manner we Catholics consider Anglo-Catholics guilty of heresies, and therefore perforce

must oppose them. Mr. Moore states that he holds many doctrines in common with us, such as Apostolic Succession, the Real Presence and many others. May I add, that it is not a question of what a few Anglo-Catholics maintain as the truth, but what the Anglican Church holds as the truth? It is easily proved that the vast majority of Anglicans oppose bitterly those very doctrines which you, Mr. Moore, hold in common with us. Not only did Cranmer, the first Protestant, not Anglo-Catholic, Bishop of Canterbury deny them, but even at the present day, there are bishops, deans and parsons who not only positively reject them, but who do all in their power to prevent such doctrines from gaining any foot-hold among their people. The point then is, we are brought to the sad conclusion, that the Anglican Church is of such a chaotic nature, as to retain in its fold those, even though they be bishops, deans and archdeacons who publicly teach essentially uncatholic doctrines, and this with as much approbation as those meet with who teach the opposite. Nay further, it not only retains them in its fold and has done so for the last 350 years, but moreover it dare not and cannot expel them. For were the Anglican Church to decide in favor of Episcopalianism as a Divine institution, it would mean that probably about one-half the clergy and three-quarters of her laity would secede from her communion; if she were to decide against it, the whole of the Tractarian tradition would be destroyed. These are the words of the late Mgr. Benson, who knew, I believe, something about what the "true Church of England" teaches. Now the question to be studied by you, Mr. Moore, is this: how can you give your allegiance to a Church wherein according to you, such a damnable heresy obtains among one-half its clergy and three-quarters of its laity? Just fancy the Fathers of Nice, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople and Trent, glorying in the fact that one-half of them stoutly defend a doctrine which the other half just as stoutly repudiated. You personally, however, are ashamed of such "comprehensiveness." But I put you this plain, blunt question: Why are you ashamed? Is it because you are convinced that it is wrong? If so, you stand before the world self-condemned, as one who claims to be a true and loyal member of a Church, which he knows tolerates within its fold, men who teach a doctrine which according to him is blasphemous and heretical. The same argument holds against you with regard to the other doctrines which you say are common to Catholics and Anglo-Catholics. These are as vehemently denied by the greater part of Anglicans, as they are defended by Anglo-Catholics. So here again you are in the midst of persons who according to your views, are blaspheming heretics. If the Kikuyu scandal, "Foundations," the heretical teachings of Sanday, Streeter and Thompson, who have denied in book and pulpit the very *fundamentals of Christianity*, have not opened your eyes to the falsity of the Anglican position then I ask, what will? Evidently your place is not in the storm-tossed, battered hulk of Anglicanism, but in the peaceful bark of Peter. Here you will find rest for your soul and peace of mind, as did Newman, Manning, Faber, Maturin and Benson, who courageously forsook the religion of their youth, because they learned but too well, what the "true Church of England" teaches.

Spring Hill, Ala.

E. J. F.

Have We Nothing?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In passing recently through Montreal, Canada, I was much struck by the architectural beauty of the new Loyola College which the Canadian Jesuits are erecting for the English-speaking students of the city. The buildings when completed will number seven, of which three are fast nearing completion. There is a

degree of artistic beauty and harmony in the group that is strangely lacking in similar Catholic institutions in the States. In olden times architecture above all other arts seemed to be the exclusive possession of Catholics, and one cannot recall the beauties of the medieval universities without a sigh, but nowadays Catholic educational institutions seem to prefer barracks or factories as models rather than the Gothic glories of the past. And this, too, notwithstanding the fact that our Protestant neighbors are adopting as their own the priceless Catholic architecture of the past. Could not our American Catholics take a lesson in building from our Canadian brethren?

New York.

O. S.

Delinquents and Laundries

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Whether you will esteem a letter from one not of your Communion I know not, but at least I am a fairly faithful reader. I may turn Roman Catholic yet if my friends don't stop thrusting the *Menace* down my throat. I also read the Chicago papers, and a grave pronouncement in one of these has been tickling my funny-bone ever since I saw it. Some learned alienist in charge of delinquent women reported that the greater number of them were of such a state and degree of mentality that the occupation best fitted for them was laundry-work. Higher grade intellects did not do nearly as well. That is a dreadful blow to my pride, for I am a Ph.D., but terribly proud of my ability as a "notable housekeeper," especially in *re* ironing fine linen. Of course we should all listen humbly to the expert, so where do the Sisters of the Good Shepherd come in who have been keeping the unfortunates committed to their charge out of mischief and honorably self-supporting by that same employment "fitted to their degree of mentality"? For me, I prefer the expert who is that by the call of Our Lord, consecrated, endowed by Him with "sanctified common sense," to the "expert" who is in the expert job for the sake of the pay-check and the chance to pry into other folks' business without let or hindrance.

If the Protestant world hadn't got so far away from Mother Church, one might be able to knock the conceit out of some of these "new" discoveries. Shade of Saint Teresa!

Madison, N. J.

E. M.

"American Spelling"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I recently clipped from a prominent daily paper the following item:

A remarkable fact regarding the name of God, is that it is spelled with four letters in most of the languages of civilized peoples.

In these modern times and in this marvelous U. S. A., which is now the richest and most civilized country and government on the face of the earth, they also spell "God" with four letters, *vis.*, *G-o-d*. The trend of modern times and the enormous wealth of individuals and corporations, in these United States where wealth has been garnered in comparatively few years, seem to have driven the majority of people, both men and women, crazy for the almighty dollar. The standard by which everybody who is anybody in these modern times, is judged seems almost invariably to be, not what are they or who are they, but the golden question: "How much are they worth?" This is especially true in the great West of our country. It makes very little difference what an individual may have been in the past or what his social and moral reputation and mode of living was in the past or is at the present time. The one standard of judgment seems to apply to all and that is: "What have they got and what are they worth in the coin of the realm?"

Salt Lake City.

JESSE COOGAN.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, AUGUST 21, 1915

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, JOHN D. WHEELER.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00 (16s.)

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83d Street, New York City, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Contributions for the Mexican fund may be sent direct to AMERICA.

A New Aristocracy

THE summer heats are on with a vengeance; the result is apparent on all sides. There is wild talk in the North, wild talk in the South, wild talk everywhere. San Francisco must be particularly hot; the city is pulsing with words, words, words; the wires that radiate from it are hot with phrases. Only the other day an Exposition orator decreed in a long speech a new aristocracy for the United States; the country is still throbbing with the news. This new caste is to be "a real aristocracy made up of Apollos and Venuses and their fortunate progeny." At present there is no approach to anything like that within our borders:

Instead of such an aristocracy, we are actually building up an aristocracy of lunatics, idiots, paupers, and criminals. These unfit persons already have reached the proportions of a vast multitude—500,000 lunatics, 80,000 criminals, 100,000 paupers, 90,000 idiots, 90,000 epileptics—and we are supporting these defectives in idleness like real aristocrats, at an expense of \$100,000,000 a year; and this mighty host of mental and moral cripples is increasing, due to unrestricted marriage and other degenerative influences, at a more rapid rate than the sounder part of the population, so that they are bound in time to constitute the majority unless some check is put upon the increase. Every one of these lunatics possesses the right to vote even in States where women are not given the right of franchise.

Such a description would cause the ordinary man to despair of the "new aristocracy," but then the ordinary man is a clod, without hope or vision or initiative. The eugenicist solves the problem by four sets of words, "a health registry," "a eugenic's registry," "physical perfection contests" and "a health survey." Mystic Mesopotamia! It is just this way: the health registry will be one of the most effective means of arousing an interest in health as a personal asset. Such a registry would

be invaluable in connection with the operation of restricted marriage laws. In time, health as an asset will come to be esteemed as more precious than gold,

whereas a

eugenics registry would be the beginning of a new and glorified human race which some time, far down in the future, will have so mastered the forces of nature that disease and degeneracy will have been eliminated. Hospitals and prisons will be no longer needed, and the golden age will have been restored.

Then there will be medals for shapely ankles, tapering fingers, pearly teeth, Roman noses and loose lobes; and to make assurance doubly sure, the "health surveyor" will make a yearly inspection, put rings in fit male's noses and brass tags in fit female's ears; cooing will become lowing, soft and sweet, and the barnyard will be glorified in unfeathered bipeds. Horrid man! No, damnable ethics! Body and breeding, its message; God and morals, its aversion.

The new aristocracy that eventuates from such a philosophy of life will be just like the old, neither better nor worse. Brains and decency will go abegging and insane asylums will swarm with victims of lechery and drunkenness.

A Children's Text-Book

"CHANGE your husband every three years"; "this world would be much better off, if that legal ceremony we call marriage had never been"; are quotations from a metropolitan journal's recent interview with a woman who seems to be living up as consistently as possible to the doctrine she teaches. Moreover, those responsible for the appearance in an evening "home paper" of such wicked folly as the foregoing took care that by means of striking headlines, well-drawn cartoons and flippant comments the article should not fail to seize and hold the attention of all who perused the paper. That is only one example of the kind of "copy" which now abounds in "representative evening papers." Such articles have become a commonplace. "Everybody reads them"; few are scandalized at them; and there is scarcely a boy or girl ten years old or over who cannot fare sumptuously every day on this delicate soul-food. It is not hard to see what a baneful effect the constant reading of papers that counsel "changing your husband every three years" will have on the growing children of a family. A writer of the day describes the influence thus:

One of the worst offenders against the life of the home is frequently the daily newspaper. Its standards are those of the street; it is made for consumption on street-cars and crowded trains. It has a habit of tearing down all reserves and, compiled largely by young men who affect a cynical indifference to everything that might be labeled ideal, it takes the world in terms of its lowest and least desirable factors. But it finds its way into every home; it is the child's most potent text-book. Everybody reads some of it; the least one in the home can comprehend its crude, often infantile drawings, its alleged funny pictures. The paper is at liberty to

print what it will within certain civil restrictions; but we are not obliged to feed our children on what would certainly pervert their appetites, foster base conceptions of the home, and cultivate the habit of taking parenthood and home-living as a ridiculous joke. Often even the "family paper" is like the "family entrance" to a saloon, an open door into the very worst aspects of life. It results in the child's mental picture of the whole world as a round of scandal and divorce, of the fields of the world as one great moral garbage heap, of the abnormal as the normal. The matter is much more serious than we realize. The newspaper is the child's interpreter of life. What life will be to him later depends on what it now means to him. Surely the home owes it to itself, for its own preservation, to see to it that mental food so abnormal, so destructive of the tastes, appetites, and moral powers of life, is kept out of the child's mental dietary.

There is an editor, the story goes, who will not admit into his home the paper he manages. He is not averse, however, it would seem, to other men's families reading his journal. But every Christian father, worthy of the name, should see that his wife and children are safeguarded from "family papers" that make light of the Ten Commandments.

The Prisoner and You

TIME was when prisoners were prisoners, nothing more nor less, just criminals who committed a crime and were under punishment for it. Those were the days when men put God and morality above sentiment and utility. God's claims were acknowledged, and a new council of perfection had not been invented by "uplifters" who know all about contraceptives, sterilization and vasotomy, but have forgotten the Sixth Commandment. But the old order has changed. God is disappearing from man's ken and maudlin sentiment is replacing sturdy common sense. Hence it is that prisoners are no longer criminals, but "just unfortunate boys," "victims of adenoids or irregular teeth"; or, if you will, silk-hosed youths, heroes of "prison marriages" and "social visits"; guests of the State, who besides enjoying a thousand and one other privileges "should be supplied with nightshirts, sheets and underclothing," "be permitted to receive daily newspapers," "buy toilet articles and have family photographs and pictures 'of a proper character' in their cells." That is all "very lovely"—for the prisoner, not for the taxpayer, however. The criminal, already a parasite on society by reason of his crime, is to be made a double burden on "the honest citizen who labors in the sweat of his brow for his daily bread. John and Michael are to go down into the trenches day after day, in fair weather and foul, and hammer in discomfort to help support in ease the slug who scorned work from the time he reached the age of reason, and now sits in a cell reading the daily paper, or gazing at pretty pictures or applying violet talcum powder to his rosy jowls.

Sentiment has gone mad; it always does when a certain class of men and women, well-known to nerve

specialists and alienists, are driven by the spirit of evil to study godless sociology, abnormal psychology and other perversions in order to help the devil in his campaign against righteousness. Give such folk full fling and prisoners will have electric fans, pages, pretty waitresses at whom to make eyes, and all the comforts of home. It will but remain for the State to issue illustrated catalogues, setting forth the advantages of prison life. Meantime the noise of John's and Michael's picks will resound beneath the surface of the earth, and exhausted after a hard day's work, the laborers will conclude that judged from a human standpoint, it pays to be a thief and a murderer. On with the "uplift," up with the criminal, down with the taxpayer!

The Pope and the Press

A SHORT time since the Holy Father issued a letter imploring the rulers of the nations at war to stop the slaughter of men and give thought to peace. People and press of neutral countries were pleased, not so however the press of some of the belligerent nations. The war was on, and slaughter or no slaughter it would go on, till victory was achieved, and none were left to enjoy peace save kings, women and children and smug editors sitting in swivel chairs, far removed from the smell of powder. In other words, the press scorned the Pontiff's plea. His counsel and exhortation meant nothing to it; he was wrong in fact, implication and principle. Just here lies a curious difficulty. A few weeks before the same Pontiff was the object of attack by the same press, especially by the French and British press. He was held up to scorn for what editors were pleased to call his "dereliction in not condemning acts of the enemy." His advice had failed at the very time the world needed it; his infallibility broke down in a great crisis; his prestige was lost; his power was broken. The dear old *Spectator*, maidenly even in her wrath, shook in an effort to control her anger. The non-Conformist press, always easily upset by somebody else's crimes, was visibly shocked, and the "shocks" found their way into print. whilst the *Guardian*, seldom objective but ever a faithful upholder of a dignified smugness, actually attempted a witticism to the effect that:

"the representative of God upon earth" is afraid of the Germans. The confession is enough to rob the Vatican of the last shred of its credit and influence—a credit and influence which had already been sorely shaken by a Pontiff who thinks that some of the worst crimes in history will be sufficiently condemned—when he knows who has won—by issuing a Code for the Polite Conduct of War in Future.

The *Guardian* forgot to say that the confession was its own, not the Pope's; his Holiness is never stupid or impudent, nor does his humor resemble the "whisking" of a rheumatic elephant. But that is neither here nor there. The point is this: a short time since the press so longed for the counsel of his Holiness that when it was

not forthcoming, it declared him fatuous; a shorter time since his Holiness gave counsel and the press declared him fatuous. The reason? The ox gored in both cases was not the same, and the infallibility of the press is independent of truth and peace and prudence.

Cowardly Neutrality

A STRICT neutrality in the present war is expected of every American citizen. Its observance will conduce to the individual's peace of soul and to courteous and friendly relations with his fellow-citizens. Whatever his sympathies with any of the contending hosts, this regard for the opinions of others will check the utterances of prejudices and passions too easily aroused, and ever ready to take the bit and run wild. But there is a battlefield where neutrality cannot be tolerated. There is a conflict in which we are not mere passive spectators, but active belligerents. Here we must take sides. For a struggle is ever raging in the world, more tragic in its progress and results than Von Hindenburg's onslaught on the forces of the Czar, or the charges and counter-charges of German and French regiments on the shell-sprayed trenches of the Vosges and the Argonne. "You cannot serve God and Mammon." Here we must choose. Neutrality would be cowardice. God and Mammon are irreconcilably opposed to each other. Their ends, their principles, are mutually contradictory. Mammon and the world mean all that Christ and His Gospel condemn, the age's insatiate greed of power and wealth, its Babylonian lust of forbidden pleasure, its contempt of decency and self-restraint, its unbelief, its indifference to the rights of God, its fatuous declaration of independence of His laws. There can be neither alliance nor peace between the two rivals. The gifts of Mammon cannot be enjoyed in conjunction with the supernatural gifts of God. "The world is the enemy of God." It is "seated in wickedness." Yet our generation has made its choice. Mammon beholds millions thronging to his shrine; he showers his golden gifts upon them; he lifts the cup of pleasure to their lips. But the gifts soon become iron bonds of slavery, the cup overflows with wormwood and gall. The service of God demands humility, gentleness, obedience, the virility of true manhood, the noble power of sacrifice. That service still has its true loyal soldiers. But too many neutrals hover on the edge of the opposing armies. They treacherously flit from camp to camp. Half-hearted worshipers of Mammon, they stealthily creep into the outer chambers of his temple, yet pretend they have not deserted the courts of the Living God. Such is the arch-neutral who says: "One religion is as good as another." Such are the Catholic parents who for social rank and prestige send their sons to colleges and universities where their Faith is undermined. A dangerous neutral is the Catholic politician who has a pew in his parish church, is a member of Catholic societies, yet who when his Faith is attacked on the plat-

form, in the halls of Congress, lifts no protest, but remains unmanfully dumb. A pitiable neutral is the Catholic mother, who says that she dearly prizes the innocence of her daughters, yet allows them to follow the pagan fashions of the day, and be present at plays and entertainments where everything sacred is outraged and ridiculed. We tremble at Christ's ultimatum against such neutrality. It is not veiled in the suave language of a deceitful diplomacy. It rings out in clear, simple but solemn words: "He that is not with me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth." "You cannot serve two masters."

Liberty, Its Use and Abuse

FOR nearly a year, Catholic leaders have been endeavoring to rid the United States mails of much noisome stuff. Commenting on these efforts, a non-Catholic correspondent, "H. F. G.," lays down the following propositions:

(1.) Liberty means liberty of dissent as well as liberty of assent. (2.) Liberty is decidedly a blessing even to those who suffer from it. To whatever extent, for instance, the Catholic Church suffers in this country from the abuse of liberty, it benefits under liberty to a far greater extent. Far better liberty abused than no liberty.

"H. F. G." clouds the issue somewhat by an arbitrary terminology; his liberty seems to know nothing of law. "Liberty," he claims, "means liberty of dissent as well as liberty of assent." Of course, it does, in a sense; but accepting the principle without gloss, I am free to dissent from the proposition that the whole is greater than any part, that two plus two make four, that white is not black. More: I am free to dissent from "H. F. G.'s" fundamental position, thus leaving him, on his own showing, utterly without a case.

The first fallacy of the proposition lies in the wholly unwarranted assumption that the intellect is free. By the law of its being, the intellect is bound to assent to ascertained truth. St. Augustine's famous dictum, *in dubiis libertas*, far from giving countenance to intellectual indifferentism, merely stresses the law, that the intellect cannot rest save in the clear cognition of the truth. Nor, unless we are prepared to welcome general anarchy, can the will be said to be morally free. Despite the fact that he is endowed with a will that is physically free and can violate every law, human or divine, man ever remains bound by the natural law, to choose good and reject evil.

"H. F. G.'s" second proposition is a curious combination of paradox, misconception and truism. Accidentally suffering may be a blessing; in itself it is not something to be desired. It is also certainly true that the Catholic Church, so largely free in this country to work out her mission, has flourished under American ideals of liberty. This, however, does not justify, as "H. F. G." seems to think, the continuance of the campaign of libel. Few will

deny that "liberty abused is better than no liberty," but liberty, without a license that might easily be repressed, is better. Liberty is perfected, not weakened or destroyed, by restraining those who abuse it.

LITERATURE

The Catholic's Bookshelf

COVENTRY PATMORE*

IN Mr. Sargent's portrait of Coventry Patmore, the most dramatic of modern portrait painters has made the old poet stand at least nine feet high. It is a wonderful portrait this, by a man whose art expresses human character down to the last detail. Austere, arrogant, contemptuous, remote, the old frosty face represents not only a thousand conservatisms, but also a loyalty, a simplicity, a Quixotism which were the very essence of the man and the poet.

He was of the elect and he knew it; and the society of the elect was very small in his mind. I do not think that he belonged to the old English aristocracy, but he had naturally its pride, its limitations, its self-complacency. To meet him, unless you were of the elect, was a thoroughly alarming experience. When he looked at you you felt that you were "of the damned people," to quote Lord Alvarley, a Radical, a Dissenter, a snob; all in fact that he held in abhorrence.

His personality, his external personality, was very old-fashioned. It took no account at all of Progress with a big P. He abhorred Democracy. The Science which is not the Daughter of God would have been a baggage to him; it was well that he was spared the horrors of the Feminist Movement. He belonged very much to the type of high-minded, somewhat narrow English gentlemen and idealists produced by Eton and Oxford in Early Victorian days, so many of whom made and swelled the Oxford Movement. "The Angel in the House," shows that Patmore as a young man was very much at home in the life of the Cathedral Close, with its urbanities, its refinements, its smooth and gracious prosperities; but when there came the moving of the waters it was quite to be expected that he would be drawn to the Church which is at once the most aristocratic and the most democratic of all institutions.

I am quite sure that behind the terrifying aspect the old poet presented to me, there was a real simplicity and a real loveliness. Three women found him very lovable; he gave "The Angel in the House" two successors. I remember Christina Rossetti, on extenuation of his three marriages, saying that he needed a woman's care. Someone going to see him in his days of widowerhood found him weeping in the dark. Women, well-bred women, were always profoundly interesting to him. In one of the delightfully dextrous verses of "The Angel in the House," he says:

A woman is a foreign land
Of which, though there he settle young,
A man can ne'er quite understand
The customs, polity and tongue.

Well, in a limited sense he was at home in that country; no poet had written more exquisitely and more humanly of the relations between men and women. But his woman was always the Elect Lady. I doubt that he could have taken any interest in a *mésalliance*, or the mind of a peasant.

"The Angel" has very much the same atmosphere as those novels of Miss Charlotte Yonge's which were so much ad-

*The seventh of a series of critical papers about books that should be in the educated Catholic's library.

mired by the pre-Raphaelites. After the darkness of the eighteenth century, and the parting of the ways which produced a religious revival outside the Church of England and not inside it as Wesley fondly hoped, the English Church had become high-mindedly idealistic, and if not aristocratic, at least gentle.

"The Angel in the House" is in fact an Early Victorian novel in poetry, with the delicacies, the reticences of its period and its type, and as such it had a great popularity; but apart from the routine of its lunches, dinners, balls, love-makings, goings to church, which have an air, almost smug, of refined and comfortable English uppermost middle-class life, where the existing and desirable stability was firmly established as by the will of Heaven, there are flashes and phrases in the poem strange enough in their context. Under the smooth surface, the conventional air, the lover breaks bounds and springs like a lark in a cage:

The winds that in the garden toss
The Guelder roses, give me pain;
Alarm me with the dread of loss
Exhaust me with the hope of gain.

The wings of will spread idly as do
The bird's that in a vacuum lies;
My breast asleep with dreams of you
Forgets to breathe and bursts in sighs.

I see no rest this side the grave
No rest nor hope from you apart;
Your life is in the rose you gave,
Its perfume suffocates my heart.

Such poetry as this, such wisdom as:

Through passionate duty love flames higher
As grass grows taller round a stone

must have sometimes caused popularity a misgiving. After all it was the domesticities, the fond detail of "The Angel"; to say nothing of its fortunate name, which made it widely read in a day when the domesticities were the fashion set by royalty. But popularity fled from the "Odes," though the finest of them had a simplicity and a clearness beyond the nimble dexterity of "The Angel." "The Unknown Eros" was given to me when I was a girl by an Irishwoman, distinguished in letters as in other things, with the remark: "You will perhaps be able to understand it, I cannot make head or tail of it." Well, I can hardly believe she tried. "The Toys" presents no riddle; nor do "It was not Like Your Great and Gracious Ways," and "If I were Dead You'd Sometimes say 'Poor Child!'"

It is a long way from "The Angel in the House" to "The Unknown Eros," and I think in that space there occurred Patmore's conversion to the Catholic Church. The Eros of "The Angel," though a beautiful spirit, yet lived in houses and among everyday people, in an atmosphere which has a touch of dowdiness like all those Early Victorian days and what they comprised. He had, in the interval, included various other domesticities: "Amelia," "Tamerton Church Tower," "Victories of Love," all just slightly dowdy, though full of beauties, as though crinoline had been put on this Eros despite his wings.

In "The Unknown Eros" there is all the difference between flight and being tethered to the earth. This volume gives Patmore his place among the immortalities, as a great spiritual as well as a great human poet:

For ah, who can express
How full of bonds and simpleness
Is God.
How narrow is He,
And how the wide waste field of possibility
Is only trod

Straight to His homestead in the human heart.
And all His art
Is as the babe's that wins his Mother to repeat
Her little song so sweet.

And again, not of the way of a man with a maid, but the way
of God with the sinner.

Yet what returns of love did I endure
When to be pardoned seemed almost more sweet
Than aye to have been pure!
But day still faded to disastrous night
And thicker darkness changed to feebler light,
Until forgiveness, without stint renewed
Was now no more with loving tears imbued,
Vowing no more offence.
Not less to thine Unfaithful did'st thou cry
"Come back, poor child, be all as 'twas before."
But I
"No, no; I will not promise any more!
Yet when I feel my hour is come to die
And so I am secured to continence,
Then may I say, though haply then in vain
"My only, only Love, O take me back again."

And here for the last quotation must be a poem which
ranks among the poignancies of literature to which these
poems of earthly and heavenly love contribute so much:

If I were dead you'd sometimes say, "Poor Child!"
The dear lips quivered as they spoke
And the tears broke
From eyes, which, not to grieve me, brightly smiled.
Poor Child, poor Child!
I seem to hear your laugh, your talk, your song.
It is not true that Love will do no wrong.
Poor Child!
And did you think when you so cried and smiled
How I in lonely nights should lie awake
And of those words your full avengers make?
Poor Child, poor Child!
And now, unless it be
That sweet amends thrice told are come to thee,
O God, have Thou no mercy upon me!
Poor Child!

KATHARINE TYNAN.

REVIEWS

De Ethica Naturali. Prælectiones Scholasticæ Abbreviatæ
ad Usum Privatum Scholarum in Universitate Gregoriana.
C. MACKSEY, S.J. Romæ: Ex Universitate Gregoriana. \$1.50.

Those who have made the acquaintance of Father Macksey's works on Psychology and Cosmology will be glad to learn that a third volume, uniform in method with the two former volumes, but more extended and detailed, has just been made available for the American public. Were there needed any testimony to its thoroughness, lucidity and scholarly accuracy, it is to be found in the fact that the book has grown out of a year's lectures in the famous university of the Society of Jesus in Rome. With the modesty that characterized the printing of the author's previous works on philosophy, Father Macksey did not intend at first to give his study of ethics to the general public, having printed it merely for the convenience of his pupils in Rome. Acting, however, under the persuasion of certain educators in this country, who wished to use the book as the text in the class-rooms of colleges in America, he has had a limited number of copies sent to Boston College, Boston, Mass., although he has not as yet put it into the hands of any American publisher.

The field of Catholic ethics has long been fixed in its general outlines; and so, in the scope and treatment of the matter, in the general sequence of the theses, and in the main features of the argument, Father Macksey has conformed to traditional lines. The excellence of the book consists rather in the independence of thought with which the

author has approached the subject. Refusing to be shackled by the order of his predecessors, or to swear by the words of previous writers, he has made a very successful effort to simplify, clarify, unify and coordinate theses which, in spite of their being recognized as intimate parts of a whole, have only too often appeared as disparate and disconnected. This is particularly noticeable in the usually confusing treatise, *De Fundamentis Moralitatis*. The method throughout, as was to be expected in a series of lectures delivered almost literally within hearing of the Vatican, is eminently scholastic both in thought and phraseology. The reader is never permitted to advance to the proof until he has eliminated from the discussion, by a succession of veiled distinctions, everything except the exact point under consideration. The proofs proceed for the most part by way of the syllogism, and are followed by brief but clear exposition of principles, which point the way to the solution of important difficulties. The book is a contribution to the literature of ethics, and should find a place on the shelves of every professor of the subject, both for its intrinsic usefulness, which is enhanced by a good index, and for its fairly copious references to St. Thomas and standard authorities. Some of the colleges are already preparing to substitute it for their present textbooks, although it will prove hard reading for most college boys. Seminaries will find it invaluable for their reference libraries, and where Latin is the language of the lecture-room, suitable for their regular codex.

J. H. F.

Questions of Moral Theology. By Rev. THOMAS SLATER, S.J. New York: Benziger Brothers. \$2.00.

It would be a mistake to infer from the foregoing title that this book is of interest only to the clergy. It is doubtless of importance to them, but the questions under discussion are of equal concern to the intelligent laity. Many of the papers in fact deal with economic or sociological subjects which have seldom been so extensively treated from their ethical point of view. They include such titles as "The Moral Aspect of Stockwatering," "Bankruptcy and Conscience," "Unearned Increment and Title by Accession," "Secret Commissions in Trade" and "Deals in Options and Future." The author's point of view is always clearly expressed in a straightforward and satisfactory way. The ethics of business present special difficulties to the student of moral theology because, as the author says, he has no clear notion of the operations in question. Father Slater's own knowledge of these subjects is evidently based upon careful and thorough study, and his application of Catholic principles is plain and unhesitating. He is happy likewise in his delineation of modern sociology, describing its oscillation between the two extremes of mechanism and idealism, while the rational Catholic doctrine of the constitution of States and of the conduct of private life, as detailed in our treatise on natural law and traced authoritatively by Leo XIII in his Encyclical on the "Christian Constitution of States," has not yet been fully understood. "Its sound common sense would recommend it to all reasonable men." Other subjects of practical utility are likewise dealt with in these essays. If in questions open to controversy the author's views may at times be challenged by the trained theologian, they are nevertheless sustained by cogent reasoning. The book can well be recommended to non-Catholics for "The doctrine taught by the Catholic Church is vitally necessary for the modern world."

J. H.

What Should I Believe? By GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$1.50.

This is Dr. Ladd's most recent contribution to the literature of philosophy. Its sub-title, "An Inquiry into the Nature,

Grounds and Value of the Faith, of Science, Society, Morals and Religion," discloses the scope of the work. Written in the author's usual urbane and genial style, it is reverent and sincere throughout, and bears ample evidence of his good intentions. It contains much that is commendable but quite as much that is reprehensible. The opening chapter is devoted to a synthesis of faith. The result is bewildering rather than enlightening. We summarize in the words of the author: "Faith is not knowledge, nor mere sentiment, nor pure thought." What then is it? Dr. Ladd does not attempt a formal definition. Belief is an unexplained, and largely or wholly inexplicable, assent of the mind; it chiefly originates in our sentiments or in our practical needs; its assurance comes out of the unexplored depths of feeling, and the belief itself with its irresistible conviction depends forever on its own internal evidence. Imagination plays a leading rôle in the construction of the objects believed in. This is especially true when there is question of faith in religious or moral tenets. Our profounder feelings or our more important practical needs postulate belief in something which is least provided for through the observations of the senses, or by those inferences from sense observations which fall strictly within the sphere of knowledge. Imagination responds to the call, and lo! the demand is satisfied. Reason must now be brought to bear on our beliefs, not indeed with any intent of scientifically demonstrating them, but merely to purify and support them. The received and established teaching represents faith as an intellectual assent based on, and proportioned to, the knowledge and veracity of a witness. If words are to be taken in their current meaning, Dr. Ladd's perplexing synthesis perverts all this. However, not a single cogent argument for so radical a view is advanced.

The reviewer's dissatisfaction is only increased when he turns to the author's concept of God. From the present work, it is difficult to decide whether or not Dr. Ladd is a pantheist. In places he writes like a man who believes in a personal God distinct from the universe, whereas elsewhere he seems to be speaking the language of monism. Our third and final stricture deals with the author's notion of morality. His shortcoming here is but a corollary of his teaching about God. He fails to bring out the real import of a morally good act, and he keeps clear of the fundamental question, whence comes the obligation of leading moral lives. In the present book, he has not grasped the essential relations of the creature to the Creator and, as a logical consequence, the lengthy chapter on "The Faiths of Morality" is superficial and pernicious.

It is in books like that under review, where grave errors are scattered among undeniable truths, that there lurks the greatest danger. Paradoxical though it may sound, such works do much harm precisely because their good qualities deceive the unsuspecting reader. If a writer of Dr. Ladd's accredited scholarship is so much in the dark, not to say in grave error, on such fundamental subjects as the nature of God, of faith and of morality, his latest work cannot but beget skepticism and open denial, while the more confiding among his readers will be led on rationally to break completely with something so shadowy and so elusive as religious faith is said to be, springing up we know not how, and groping after we know not what.

D. J. C.

The English Essay and Essayists. By HUGH WALKER, M.A., LL.D. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$1.50.

"The Channels of English Literature Series," of which the present work is the seventh volume, has proved itself to be a safe and reliable guide to the student who would trace the rise and development of the different branches of English

literary art, and both in scholarship and style, Professor Walker adorns the series with an important contribution to the sum of literary knowledge. The essay, as such, has not hitherto been treated in any way that may be called systematic, nor does the author altogether supply this want. He has, however, placed his readers on the highway to obtaining a very adequate knowledge of the essay; this, we may take it, is the function of a "channel," to indicate the course through which the main stream flows.

In his introduction Professor Walker discusses briefly the essay and its composition, and in subsequent chapters leads to its development, rising to what he undoubtedly considers its zenith in the Queen Anne essayists, continuing the tale down to the essayists of such recent date as Stevenson, Gissing, Francis Thompson, the treatment of whom is exceptionally sane, and John M. Synge, with just a hasty glance at the Neo-Celtic School. The author will be appreciated for the sympathetic treatment he accords the individual essayists he enumerates; a quality that will make the volume welcome in the higher studies of literature in schools and colleges, and, undoubtedly, whet the literary appetites of students for a fuller acquaintance with the works discussed.

Professor Walker lays down, more or less, a rough canon of criticism, one of the elements of which is impartiality in the critic; an element which, one would think, would apply also to himself in his work, which is ultimately, an extended critical essay. It is surprising, therefore, that on occasion the Professor leaves the highway of criticism, steps off so to speak, to brush up against "Romanism," creating a slight, but entirely unnecessary diversion from the real matter in hand. A small affair, indeed, as the facts show, but none the less a deviation from the even flow of his critical estimation of the essay *qua* essay; a morsel of grit which becomes an irritant in the smooth running of a happy choice of illustrative quotations and congeniality of style.

H. C. W.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The August *Month* begins with a searching review of the war's first year by Father Keating. He finds the Allies, though they have the "whole neutral world to draw from . . . are one and all lacking in numbers and military equipment." England's geographical position, and its form of government, he shows, have prevented the people from "fully understanding the requirements of the crisis and acting up to them." He looks in vain for "some widespread tokens of thrift, some abatement of luxury, some sense of the necessity of personal self-sacrifice," and deplores the sad "prevalence of the slacker." But he finds "the one consoling aspect to the Christian in all this terrible business," to be "the universality of the appeal to the Christian ideal of justice and fair-dealing." The "Miscellanea" in this issue are particularly rich in sage counsel for Pope-baiters.

"K." (Houghton, Mifflin, \$1.35) by Mary Roberts Rinehart, is a disappointment. It reads like the uninspired work of a news correspondent striving for "copy," rather than the live, enthusiastic story of a true artist, devoted to her profession. There are many signs of hurry in the book. The characters are merely names, hate and love spring up strangely and unaccountably, and "the extra sponge left in the operating field" does not explain, as it is meant to do, the central mystery of the story, *i. e.*, the famous Dr. Edwardes' loss of confidence in himself, and his taking refuge from fame in the gas office under the obscure name of "K." The story, as far as the background of truth is concerned, is real but for the most part depressingly so, and at times borders dangerously near the gross.—Frank N. Westcott, the brother of "David

Harum's" creator, has now tried his hand at a similar story and in "Hepsey Burke" (H. K. Fly, \$1.35) portrays a kindly, shrewd widow who keeps a motherly eye on a young parson and his wife. Hepsey's habit of making sententious remarks grows tiresome, while the humor of the book is often flat and sometimes wanting in delicacy.

In "Penelope's Postscripts" (Houghton, Mifflin, \$1.00) Kate Douglas Wiggin, the author of the renowned Penelope books, now carries her witty and artistic heroine through Switzerland, Venice, Wales and Devon and then shows her to us in her New England home as Mrs. Beresford, the mother of the "three loveliest models in all the countryside." To supply the usual "heart-interest" the fair Egeria goes along and meets her fate in Devon. In real life of course no merely human being could keep saying constantly such clever things as does Penelope, but in this author's books, bright remarks and amusing adventures crowd every page.

"The Children: a Message to Priests, Teachers, Parents and All Lovers of Christ's Little Ones" (Holy Childhood Association, Box 598, Pittsburgh, \$0.05; \$3.00 a hundred) is a pamphlet containing eloquent appeals which Father Joseph Husslein, S.J., Associate Editor of AMERICA makes in behalf of the Holy Child Association. He reminds the reader that the organization now has 20,000,000 members, collects annually some \$825,000, supports 256 missions, educates 600,000 children and has secured Baptism for 20,000,000 little ones who are now in heaven. The author urges the spread of the association among the children of our parish schools and emphasizes the spiritual advantages of membership.

The readers of Father Ernest R. Hull's valuable little books on Catholic apologetics will be glad to learn that, under the title of "Civilization and Culture" (Kenedy, \$0.35), he has gathered together the papers bearing on those subjects which he contributed to the *Bombay Examiner*. Beginning with a searching analysis and clear definition of the two terms, he shows wherein they differ, and then proves that the man of the "Penny Catechism," who has a sincere and practical regard for justice, honesty and truth is the most highly civilized person there is. Many "cultured" people of to-day are shown to be inferior to savages, and the Church's civilizing influence on the world is admirably described. "Fortifying the Layman," the "Formation of Character," and "Civilization and Culture" are three of Father Hull's books that educated Catholics ought to have within reach.

"Commercial Work and Training for Girls" (Macmillan, \$1.50), by Jeannette Eaton and Bertha M. Stevens, is the result of an investigation of the commercial schools of Cleveland, undertaken by the authors to find out what kind of training is given in preparing girls for office work. Fifty-two detailed records of as many business schools in Cleveland represent part of the labor expended in the preparation of this publication. The conclusions arrived at are that the schools must be freed from "hurry up" methods, more consideration should be given to the evening commercial school, and more discrimination exercised in registering pupils for business courses. Standardization of all business schools, whether public or private, would do much toward improving commercial education.

The latest number of the "Stella Maris" series is an appreciation of St. Ignatius, and St. Francis Xavier, by Father C. C. Martindale, S.J., and it is entitled "In God's Army: Commanders-in-Chief." (Benziger, \$0.50). The author's endeavor

is to catch what he calls the "personal accent" in the saints he is describing that the readers may feel they have come in soul-contact with Ignatius and Xavier. The interesting little volume makes no pretence at being a biography, but a study of these two great saints, from special points of view, and written with Father Martindale's usual literary charm.— "The Angelus Series" also has out a new little volume entitled "Love's Gradatory," (Benziger, \$0.50) by Blessed John Ruysbroeck, which Mother St. Jerome has well translated from the Brabant dialect and furnished with an excellent preface. This famous mystical work which was probably written for Margaret of Meerbeke, Precentor in the Convent of the Poor Clares at Brussels, describes the ladder of holiness which lifts the soul to God by the seven rungs of goodwill, voluntary poverty, purity, humility, nobility of virtue, the "return to primitive purity of the intellect" and lastly the repose of eternity.

The edifying "Life of Father Richard Henle, S.V.D." (Mission Press, Techny, Ill., \$0.40) who was martyred in China during the Boxer rebellion of 1897, has now been translated into English, and as a companion volume, the same publishers have ready Father Lynk's practical talks for young people on "The Lord's Prayer" (\$0.40)—"The Little Manual of St. Rita" (\$0.50) compiled by Father McGrath and a "Little Communicants' Prayer Book" by Father Sloan (\$0.20) are recent Benziger publications.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Allyn & Bacon, New York:

First Principles of Chemistry. By Brownlee and Others. \$1.25; Text-Book of Cooking. By Carlotta C. Greer. \$1.25.

D. Appleton Co., New York:

The Splendid Chance. By Mary Hastings Bradley. \$1.30; Sanitation in Panama. By William Crawford Gorgas. \$2.00.

Richard G. Badger, Boston:

Submerged. By Maxim Gorki. \$0.75; The Lutanist. By Alice Wilson. \$1.00; Letters from Prison. By Bouck White. \$0.60.

Benziger Bros., New York:

In Father Gabriel's Garden. By Ella Schmidt. \$1.00; Love's Gradatory. Translated from Blessed John Ruysbroeck by Mother St. Jerome. \$0.50.

Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis:

The Nurse's Story. By Adele Bleneau. \$1.25.

Catholic Truth Society, London:

Meditations for Lay Folk. By Bede Jarrett, O.P. Two shillings and six pence.

George H. Doran Co., New York:

Joseph Chamberlain: An Honest Biography. By Alexander Mackintosh. \$3.00; Of Human Bondage. By W. Somerset Maugham. \$1.50; Russia's Gift to the World. By J. W. Mackail. \$0.75.

E. P. Dutton & Co., New York:

The Wayfarer's Library: Prophets, Priests and Kings. By A. G. Gardiner; The Private Papers of Henry Rycroft. By George Gissing; The Widow Woman. By Charles Lee; The Lore of the Wanderer. By George Goodchild. \$0.40 each.

B. Herder, St. Louis:

Robert Hugh Benson. An Appreciation by Olive Katherine Parr. \$0.90; Life of Dominic Savio. By Ven. Dom Bosco. \$0.60; The Catholic Library. Vol. 17. Some Thoughts on Catholic Apologetics. By Edward Ingram Watkin. \$0.30; On the Breezy Moor. By M. MacDonald. \$1.50; The Holy Gospel According to St. Luke. By Rt. Rev. Mgr. Bernard Ward. \$1.00; Fourteen Eucharistic Tridua. By Lambert Nolle, O.S.B. \$1.00.

Henry Holt & Co., New York:

German Philosophy and Politics. By John Dewey. \$1.25; The Campaign of 1914 in France and Belgium. By G. H. Perris. With Thirty Maps and Plans. \$1.50.

P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York:

The War and the Prophets. By Herbert Thurston, S.J. \$1.00.

Oxford University Press, New York:

Some Love Songs of Petrarch. By William Dudley Foulke. \$1.15; Herrick's Poetical Works. Edited by F. W. Moorman. \$4.15; Vaughan's Works. Edited by L. C. Martin. Two Volumes. \$5.75.

Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York:

History of Christian Missions. By Charles Henry Robinson. \$2.50.

Sherman, French & Co., Boston:

The Will in Ethics. By Theophilus B. Stork. \$1.25; The Gates of Utterance and Other Poems. By Gladys Cromwell. \$0.80.

Volkvereins-Verlag, M. Gladbach:

Piebisatz und Optionsklausel. Von Dr. Hans Wehberg. 40 Pf.; Das Passwesen. Von Dr. Hans Wehberg. 40 Pf.

EDUCATION

Normal School Psychology

SOME years ago, while an instructor in the evening schools of the city of Boston, I was surprised to hear from a lad of fifteen years, the question, "Teacher, what is God?" I recalled at once a sentence which had impressed me forcibly, when reading the life of Saint Thomas of Aquin: *Puer capit sollicite querere a magistro, quid esset Deus?* and this, when Saint Thomas was but five years of age, and a student in the Benedictine Monastery at Monte Cassino.

After explaining to the best of my ability, notions of the Deity, such as would be appreciated by a lad of fifteen, I took occasion to mention the incident to a graduate of a State normal school, seeking information relative to methods employed for handling problems of this kind. I was surprised to learn that the normal school graduate was absolutely unable to meet the situation, and I was informed further that no instruction was ever given in the State normal schools of Massachusetts, which would prepare a teacher to meet such queries.

Aware that psychology had been long a topic of instruction in the normal schools of this Commonwealth, I made further inquiry and investigation, from which I am convinced that normal school psychology in Massachusetts, taught as it is today, is useless from the standpoint of effective equipment for a practical teacher.

Claiming the distinction of having established in 1839 at Lexington the first normal school in America, later located at Framington, Massachusetts now maintains, with annual appropriations approximating \$500,000, ten normal institutions, having an aggregate student body of 2,600, of which considerably over one-third is composed of Catholic young men and women. Let us examine in general the quality and extent of instruction offered by these schools in the subject of psychology, and trace, if possible, the causes for such.

NO UNIFORM STANDARD

Normal school psychology in Massachusetts is individualistic, extent and quality of instruction depending upon the attitude taken by the head of a particular school. No fundamentally uniform standard for this most important work has ever been established by the State Board of Education for these schools, despite the fact that with the enactment of chapter 106 of the Acts of the year 1870, the State normal schools were placed under control of the board.

In no two schools are the fundamentals of psychology treated alike, and in no school is proper attention given to the study of psychology from the rational standpoint. No examinations are required of persons selected to offer courses in this vital subject, and the results obtained can be imagined readily.

Graduates of high schools are admitted to these State institutions, and it is with such youthful students, scantily equipped from the limited curriculum of a secondary school, that the instructor in psychology is to labor. From the beginning of the course, empiricism is made the watchword. The physiological aspects of psychology are accentuated, the rational all but entirely ignored. The student is provided with advanced text-books, and from these and from lecture courses are obtained formulæ to be applied later in the class room. "Experience" is the corner-stone upon which principles are constructed, and no thought is, or can be, given to a proper appreciation of these so-called experiences from the standpoint of general principles rationally established. You may ask why does this situation exist, and the answer will be made that the psychology of today is the "new psycho-

logy," that it has been separated from philosophy, and that it is now a science of induction. No explanation is given of the alleged "separation of psychology from philosophy," and confusion results whenever proponents of the "new psychology" attempt a classification of its characteristics. We ask if it is not true that we think when we consider problems in logic, metaphysics, epistemology, ethics or natural theology, and if psychology can be considered formally in one way, materially in another, and we are told in reply that we do not understand the "spirit of modern progress." The devotee of the "new psychology" decries the use of the terms "formal" and "material" as "mere scholastic quibbling." It is admitted that mental action is co-extensive with thought, but it is insisted nevertheless, that the "new psychology" is separate from philosophy. The stand is novel as it is equally absurd and untenable.

This modern attitude, if such it may be called, is not peculiar to Massachusetts. It is co-extensive with the "new thought" development, and the harm it is inflicting upon the young teacher is beyond estimating.

No one will claim that elements of empiricism should not be considered in the study of psychology, but on the other hand it should be understood plainly that experiences are of value, not in themselves, but rather as aids utilized in the establishing of rational principles whether such be concerned with mental action alone or with a thousand and one other matters.

INFORMATION FAULTY AND NON-FUNCTIONING

Equipped with an alleged training in this "new psychology" the normal school graduate enters upon her work as a public school teacher burdened to the ground with information which is equally faulty and non-functioning. If she succeeds in her work, it is not because of the instruction received, but rather in spite of it. Failure to reach the high-water mark of efficiency as a teacher in public school work is not traceable to the teacher alone—the cause lies among other things in the method of instruction afforded in the normal schools. It is assumed of course that the normal school pupil is earnest and diligent, and this, in a majority of cases is a fact.

Repeatedly have I questioned normal school instructors relative to the general lines of development undertaken in the courses in psychology. My query in this regard had been suggested by an incident which occurred some time ago while I was traveling in company with several men. The group was representative of several callings in life. In the course of a general conversation, it became known that one of the party was a normal school graduate and a teacher. He was immediately asked by a practical farmer for a definition of psychology, and a description of the field covered by this subject. His response was an attempt to outline the component parts of the brain and a survey of the nervous system. A correlation of psychology with allied subjects was beyond his ability. Here was a teacher actually engaged in public school work, occupying, as every teacher does, a quasi-public office, and yet incapable of distributing knowledge which he should have possessed. The study of rational psychology was unknown to him, and I learned myself from him that no attempt had ever been made by his former instructor to furnish him with such necessary information.

PSYCHOLOGY IN A FIELD OF ALLIED SUBJECTS

Normal school instructors will hold that it is impossible to outline the position of psychology in a field of allied subjects, since this would take up by far too much time in the class room. I do not consider this attitude either intelligent or logical, for I have witnessed the relative position of psychology, in the field of allied subjects, brought forth in strik-

ingly clear manner in but two or three lectures given by competent men.

Shall we conclude that psychology is without kith or kin in the philosophical world? I do not believe this can be so, nor do I think that in the study of psychology we can separate ourselves from other fields, which together with psychology constitute the world of philosophy. Dialectic, at one time considered but a part of the trivium, opened the door to other departments of philosophy, and this was logical in *rerum natura*, for dialectic, although distinct from other parts of philosophy could not be separated from them. Why, therefore attempt this separation of psychology?

The pupils of the public schools are embryo men and women, and the duties of the teacher, acting in *loco parentis* are as important as they are sacred. None the less important and sacred are the duties of those who educate the teacher student. Yet it is a fact that by no class of people, more than by educators with "new thought" tendencies, are greater wrongs being committed upon the young in the faulty equipment of the public school teacher in the field of psychology. The seeds of noble womanhood and manhood are sowed in the home, in the teachings of the Church, and in the school-room. Why should the last named field attempt a nullification of the work of the first two?

From the standpoint of justice and better citizenship it is imperative that experimental educational clinics cease to be an integral part of our educational system. Better no study of psychology at all than the hodge-podge material thrust upon the teacher in our tax-supported schools. A retreat from the indefensible methods of the "new psychology," and the establishing of a proper general standard of instruction in psychology in the Massachusetts normal schools must be made by the Massachusetts Board of Education, if justice is to be rendered the young, who are incapable of demanding that which is their due. Let us hope that the reformation is near at hand.

LESTER B. DONAHUE, PH.D.

SOCIOLOGY

The Central Verein Convention

IN the midst of the unhealthy and confusing suggestions which are advanced today by individuals and associations for the solution of the social problems of this country, it is most refreshing to hear the voice of the Central Verein, the National Federation of German-American Catholic Societies, in its St. Paul convention, again calling attention to a sane and conservative program of reform, and giving to us in its own work a practical exemplification of how such a program can be carried into action. It is encouraging, too, for Catholics in general, no matter what their nationality may be, to see this organization in its sixtieth year of activity, showing the vigor and energy of youth, and recruiting from among the sons of its present members the nucleus of a strong and militant organization for the future.

The plea of Archbishop Messmer, in the sermon of the convention, for increased attention to the need of social reconstruction and the stirring cry of Archbishop Ireland, in his address, that the representatives of the Central Verein "steer according to the old charts," meeting the new questions of the day upon the unchanging principles which are made for all times, found ready response in the minds and hearts of the delegates and the action of the convention. For it is the desire to attend to the needs of the present upon the basis of the great, unchanging, fundamental truths which forms the very soul of the work of the Central Verein.

The great strength of this federation and the wide field of its influence is seen in the large number of delegates—priests and laymen—who are in attendance upon its yearly gatherings.

The present convention was in this respect like the meetings of the past. It clearly marks the Central Verein as a popular movement, vitally affecting the life and feelings of the people. Its social and religious propaganda mold in a very forceful and effective manner the views and actions of the rank and file.

THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES' WORK

The conference of the legislative committees of the various State Leagues, which was established as a permanent institution at the last convention, was one of the particularly noteworthy features of the 1915 meeting. The work of advising on legislative matters has now been crystallized in the Central Bureau of the Central Verein, and the report of that Bureau on the subject demonstrated how very successful this plan had proved during the one year of its existence. The legislative committees themselves have been more active than ever before, and they have performed a great service to the Catholic cause, particularly in defeating dangerous and undesirable legislation. They have also aided greatly in constructive legislative work, especially in the interests of the working classes.

The urgent need for Catholic workingmen's associations, which has attracted the attention of the Central Verein for a number of years, was emphasized at a meeting held for the purpose of discussing that subject. The spread of radical doctrines within the trades unions makes the formation of these associations an imperative duty of the present hour. The farmers' problem was taken up and debated upon by the convention itself. It was decided, in accordance with a thorough report of a special committee upon this matter, that the time was not ripe for a universal encouragement of the cooperative movement, the farmers in this country not being in a position at present to give to the consumer certain necessary services which the middlemen, despite many abuses in connection with their occupations, can easily give. Education of the farmer and consuming populations to a better understanding of each other's problems was urged as the need at the present time. The establishment of farmers' organizations along the proper lines was recommended.

THE WOMEN'S SECTION

The meetings of the women's and young men's sections of the Central Verein reflected the spirit of the parent body itself. The women's section, the *Frauenbund*, received a temporary form of organization at this convention. This is to be the nucleus of the permanent organization, to be formed at a future gathering. The purpose of the women's section will be to meet those phases of the social question which fall specifically within the women's sphere, such as the wider extension of charitable work. The formation of St. Elizabeth Societies, such as exist in Europe, is to be the particular endeavor of the *Frauenbund*.

THE JUNIOR SECTION

The Junior section, the Gonzaga Union, has enjoyed splendid progress during the past year, not alone in new members obtained, but in actual work accomplished. In the meetings of this body an intelligent and zealous interest was shown that augurs well for the future efforts of this organization and of the future Central Verein. The working program of the Union, adopted at its last convention, was the basis for the discussions. It was decided to carry out its provisions even the more vigorously, particularly in the formation of Boys' Clubs, in the encouragement of the "Big Brother" idea in Catholic circles, and in the protection of young men traveling to our large cities. The social study club idea, which has already borne such excellent fruit in the ranks of the young men, was especially emphasized. As Bishop Busch, of St. Cloud, declared in several of his addresses, in the young man is bound up the hope of the Catholic cause for the future, and the successes of the Gonzaga Union is one of the most encouraging features of the Central Verein.

CATHOLIC LOYALTY

That unswerving spirit of loyalty to the Holy See which has especially characterized the Central Verein throughout its long history, was evident in a striking manner at this convention. The Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Bonzano, in his remarks, dwelt upon this fact, that the Central Verein had ever held fast to Rome. As a practical proof of this matter a gift of \$1,000 was made by the convention to the Holy Father to assist him to meet the onerous burdens which have been imposed upon him by the great European war. It was also announced that over \$50,000 had been collected by the Central Verein for the war sufferers in Austria and Germany.

The true Catholic atmosphere which pervaded the whole convention, the spirit of thorough and sincere endeavor which was at all times in evidence, the certain and decisive manner in which all questions were taken up and disposed of, should make the sincere Catholic feel greatly encouraged for the future, thankful that such a militant organization exists to confront with a real Catholic philosophy and Catholic outlook the problems of the day. May the Central Verein enjoy another sixty years of activity, productive of ever-increasing good!

LOUIS BUDENZ,

Central Bureau of the Central Verein.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Supreme Tribunal of the Segnatura has rejected Count Boni de Castellane's appeal that his marriage case be sent back to the S. Roman Rota for rehearing thus confirming the decision of the first Rota Bench, declaring the marriage valid. After the second decision which was against her claim, Anna Gould refused to go on with the case stating, according to report, that she could not hope for justice in Rome. Despite her unjust criticism of Roman papal procedure, she has received justice at the hands of a Supreme Roman Court.

There has been a great increase of missionary activity during the last few years among Catholic Deaf Mutes. Only about twenty priests and sisters were enrolled for the work according to the Educational report of 1907. Today there are actively engaged in the field forty-one priests who are giving a whole or part of their time to this educational work. The sign language is being studied in six different seminaries, so that at the completion of the seminary course priests will be thoroughly equipped to take up this important apostolate. There is also an increase in the number of Catholic schools for the deaf.

Though according to the Protestant tradition Jesuits, the world over, are largely occupied in plotting against the government of the country in which they live, in England at least they seem to have taught their students patriotism. For Stonyhurst has 435 alumni actively engaged in the war and many are waiting for commissions: Beaumont College has nearly 300 ex-students serving in the army or navy; St. Francis Xavier, Liverpool, is represented by 106 in the army; Mt. St. Mary's has 160 with the colors; Wimbledon, 252; Stamford Hill, 82; Glasgow, 100; Preston, 68; Leeds, 62, and the Jesuit College of Riverview, Australia, has sent 100 former students to the front. The editor of the *Protestant Observer*, however, is not at all impressed by such figures, but wonders how the Admiralty and the War Office can "expect the blessing of Almighty God" on the arms of the Allies, when the Bishop of Chelmsford and Lord Wimborne, and even Queen Alexandra, have countenanced divers flagrantly papistical practices. "It is useless to disguise the fact," continues the

Observer, "that the program of Rome is being steadily accomplished." Quite true. And a very simple program it is: Loyalty to God and country, even to the shedding of blood.

The *Allgemeine Rundschau* brings a detailed report of the Catholic Women's War Day, held at Frankfurt under the auspices of the Catholic Women's League. It is gratifying to note the practical nature of the subjects treated and the absence of mere war tirades. The topics were all reducible to four headings: the nourishing of the people, the care of war widows and orphans, popular morality, the youth of the nation. They were all subjects of deepest interest for women, and their selection indicated the important part that Catholic women are taking in preserving, through their fidelity to domestic duty, the high standard of Catholic morality in these difficult times. The war itself, in the closing words of the presiding officer, was to be made "a guide to higher things." The ennobling of family life and the strengthening of the feeling of motherhood's responsibilities were held out to the convention as woman's holiest duties.

The Procurator of the Belgian Missions, Rev. Joseph Hoogers makes a strong appeal in the *Good Work* on behalf of the foreign missions:

What I want are only pennies and dimes, but so many that they may in the long run be equivalent to gold and silver. I ask them in the form of "stamps," those little fragments thrown away every day all over the world. If some one, shrugging his shoulders, condemns our bold attempt as inadequate, and not in proportion to the purpose aimed at, I can only point to the noble, strenuous figure of a man who was called "The Lord's stamp collector," the Rev. Jos. Theodore Stein, who died recently, and who was the pastor of a small parish in Wurtemberg. For thirty-three years he was busy gathering stamps on behalf of mission work. By sale of stamps, albums, collections, by gifts in money, and other fragments, he realized, during that time, the amount of \$40,000, gave support to two hundred different missions, and redeemed more than two thousand heathen children!

The support that Protestant missions receive in money contributions often passing the million mark, makes this modest plea for Catholic help for the foreign missions seem very mild. To answer it there is need of little wealth, but great good-will. Surely it is worth the trouble.

A week ago a Good Government meeting was held in the Y. M. C. A. hall of Germantown, Pa. It was to have been held in the Town Hall, but as the purpose of the meeting was to attack Catholics, and also to denounce a very prominent Presbyterian who happens to be President of these United States, the doors of the Town Hall were closed in the face of the fanatical sowers of discord. The circular issued by a man named Fox, speaks for itself:

You are earnestly invited to attend a real anti-Roman Catholic lecture. The best well-known lecturer, and the man who was responsible for the recent upheaval in Chicago, has been engaged, and will deliver his strongest lecture, based on personal contact and experience. Mr. Peterson, another lecturer and traveler, will show us why we should be Protestants seven days a week. These lecturers are the most powerful obtainable.

The only thing to be regretted about this Good Government rally is that there was any hall in Germantown that could open its doors to bigots of the Fox ilk. The man's name is significant, as Herod's was.

The *Outlook* is much concerned about the last Encyclical of our Holy Father. Indeed it is even disappointed:

The Pope has issued another plea for peace addressed to the belligerent Powers. . . . This plea can hardly be other than disappointment to radical pacifists and to loyal members of the Roman Catholic Church. The plea will dis-

appoint the pacifists because . . . it proposes no plan by which peace can be secured. . . . The plea will disappoint churchmen because it is wholly lacking in authority. . . . It has not the tone of moral authority which the world both Protestant and Catholic has a right to expect from one who claims to be the "Vicar of the Eternal and Supreme Judge before whom all shall be called to account."

The folly of the Vatican to attempt any move in the cause of peace without consulting the *Outlook*! Certainly the Pope should have spoken with more authority, so as not to disappoint Protestants, whose very name means a protest against his assumption of the authority belonging to Christ's vicar.

Bishop Williams of Michigan, preaching in Grace Church a few Sundays ago talked to his New York audience of the "rags and pomp" of church services:

The ecclesiasticism of to-day and those who administer it are to be compared with the scribes and pharisees. There is abroad in the church a passion for names, a crude theology and a strong desire to ticket every man and file him away. The vast majority of people know a Christ of dogma, tenets and impractical theology. People give Him names, and then set Him aside—on a Sunday shelf. Such Christ is not real and does not live among the people. The real Christ is hidden in names and rags of pomp.

A few hundred years ago the founders of Bishop Williams' church, left the Church to bring back the simple Evangel. It looks as if the Reformation did not reform, if the so-called Reformers are today in a position where Christ is placed on a Sunday shelf.

The *English Church Times* prints a very frank note from an Anglican chaplain at the Dardanelles:

One very soon finds out that the limitations of Protestantism have to be shed and discarded in dealing with crowds of wounded men, many of them at the point of death. Some desire the Blessed Sacrament, and unless one has got the Reserved Sacrament, one simply has to confess one's inability to give them that supreme consolation. Only the other day a Nonconformist chaplain came off to this ship to beg some wafers, so that he might reserve the Sacrament and be able to administer in one kind when necessity should arise!

The pity of it is that there should be any "limitations" to what purposes to be revealed truth. In time of peace the "limitations" may eventuate in rather an easy form of worship, but when the bugle-call means a summons to death, men demand more than limitations of truth. They want it all.

From the New York office of the *Far Eastern Bureau* comes a very strong plea for a better understanding of the Chinese who have suffered so much from the irresponsible stories of globe-trotters lured by the scent of printer's ink. The appeal for the Chinese takes the following form:

Because of bias due to bigotry, through several centuries, Roman Catholics have been reviled and abused as "worshippers of idols." It is one of the grandest facts of American citizenship that here, within our borders, more than any other place on earth, all sorts and sects of Christians, not to speak of the numerous non-Christian bodies, live together in peace, with good will, and with a tolerable comprehension of and respect for each others' religious differences. Yet, even in America, the misconception still exists among many people that Roman Catholics do "worship idols." Such being the case, there is small room for wonder that many of our Christian publicists and others, more or less well-informed upon purely Occidental matters, commit a very similar injustice towards the one people in the world least understood and least appreciated, having regard to their marvelous real accomplishments in many realms and the natural beauty of their character. Need we say that we refer to the Chinese? To charge the Chinese with "worshipping ancestors" or heroes is as ridiculous and unjust as it is to charge our Roman

Catholic fellow-citizens with "worshipping idols." Both offensive misconceptions are due to confusion caused by that "little knowledge" which we are told "is a dangerous thing."

It surely will console Catholics to know that a nation as "enlightened" as the Chinese have to suffer from vaporing journalists and all-knowing tourists. Hereafter when the secular press distorts Vatican reports, or the *Guardians of Liberty* repeat age-old calumnies while raising their eyes reverently toward the flag for which Catholics have bled, their outraged fellow-citizens will solace their wounded feelings with the cry: "Remember the Chinese!"

Gene Stratton-Porter has written ten books, and her readers number more than two millions. Among modern novelists her work ranks high, for it is eminently clean. Mrs. Porter's literary creed is simple:

My years of nature work have not been without considerable insight into human nature. I know its failings, its in-born tendencies, its weaknesses, its failures, its depth of crime, and the people who feel called upon to spend their time analyzing, digging into, and uncovering these sources of depravity have that privilege, more's the pity! If I had my way about it, this is a privilege no one could have in books intended for indiscriminate circulation. I stand squarely for book censorship, and I firmly believe that with a few more years of such books, as half a dozen I could mention, public opinion will demand this very thing. My life has been fortunate in one glad way. I have lived mostly in the country and worked in the woods. For every bad man and woman I have ever known, I have met, lived with, and am intimately acquainted with an overwhelming number of thoroughly clean and decent people who still believe in God and cherish high ideals.

More writers of this stamp will lift the modern novel from the slime to which sensuality under the guise of social uplift and sex problems have plunged it.

Sir Robert Baden-Powell places the end of the war in the year 1935, and gives his reason in the *London Chronicle*:

The war will be decided in 1935. For this reason—the true victory will lie, not so much in the actual tactical gains on the battlefield to-day, as in the quality of the men who have to carry on the work of the country after the war. War kills off the best of a nation's manhood; therefore, extra care must be exercised to save every child—not for its own sake or for its parents' sake, but for the sake of the nation.

There is a half-truth here. The whole truth is, the child should be saved for its own, its parents' and the nation's sake. To be healthy, strong and a valuable citizen seems to this great soldier to be the end of life. There is a health, strength and citizenship that is not bounded by the Empire's far-flung line, which seemingly has not entered into the ken of Sir Robert Baden-Powell.

There is a good deal of sentimentalism creeping into the American attitude toward crime and the criminal. It was shown in Pittsburgh not long ago as the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* points out:

The great man returned to his native city after an absence of nine years. Ten thousand people turned out to greet him, crying, "Welcome home." Most of them were women and young girls. No President ever received such a reception. A hundred automobiles, filled with crazed enthusiasts, raced after him, and when his home was reached the cheering mob surged over the lawn. His picture was taken hundreds of times. Who was he? A great artist? A great scientist? A great inventor? A great general? A great poet? No; he was Pittsburgh's favorite murderer.

Murder is murder whether the hand that does the deed can sign a cheque for millions, or can claim no bank account at all.